arXiv:1207.3791v1 [math.DG] 16 Jul 2012

Geometry of generalized higher order fields. Applications to classical linear electrodynamics

July 18, 2012

Ricardo Gallego Torromé
Departamento de Matemática
Universidade de São Paulo [1]

Abstract

Motivated by the problem of radiation reaction in linear classical electrodynamics, a theory of *generalized higher order tensor and differential forms* is introduced. We discuss a cohomology and integration theory for generalized higher order forms. Then we pay attention to a special type of generalized higher order field associated with *bounded maximal proper acceleration.* Using such theory of generalized higher order fields, a generalization of the Maxwell-Lorentz theory with fields living on higher order jet bundles is described. The theory is free of the pathologies of the standard linear classical linear electrodynamics. The theory is not local in the usual sense, since fields live on higher jet bundles over the spacetime. Combining the generalized higher order electrodynamics with *maximal acceleration geometry,* we show that the evolution of a point charged particle interacting with generalized higher order fields is described by solutions of a second order ordinary differential equation. Such equation is Lorentz invariant, causal, and compatible with Newton's first law and the energy-momentum conservation. In addition, it is free of run-away solutions and pre-accelerated solutions of the Dirac's type. In the final section we comment on the assumptions and on related developments of the theory presented in this work.

---

[1] email: rgallegot@gmx.de; Work financially supported by FAPESP, process 2010/11934-6.

Contents

1 Introduction **4**

1.1 Motivation 4

1.2 Criticism of the notions of exterior electromagnetic field and point test particle 5

1.3 A theory of higher order electromagnetic field 6

1.4 Structure of the work 8

1.5 Conventions 8

2 Differential geometry of jet bundles and cohomology of generalized differential forms **9**

2.1 Jet bundles and natural lifts 10

2.2 Connections on $TJ^k_0(M)$ and a covariant derivative on TM 11

2.3 Induced connections on $J^k_0 M$ from connections on TM 13

2.4 Generalized forms and tensors fields 18

2.5 Tensors and forms with values on $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ 20

2.6 Generalized metric structures 23

2.7 Isometries of generalized metrics 26

2.8 Generalized g-dual isomorphism 27

2.9 A generalized star operator 28

2.10 Length and proper time associated to generalized metrics 28

2.11 Cartan calculus for generalized forms 30

2.12 Vertical volume forms 37

2.13 Cohomology of differential forms $\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ 40

2.14 Integration of generalized forms 44

3 Maximal acceleration geometry **45**

3.1 Elements of covariant maximal acceleration 45

3.2 Perturbation scheme 47

3.3 Causal structure of the metric of maximal acceleration 50

3.4 Kinematics with metrics of maximal acceleration 51

4 A higher order generalization of the electromagnetic field and currents **52**

4.1 Generalization of the electromagnetic fields as sections of higher order jet bundles 52

4.2 The generalized excitation tensor $\bar{G}$ 54

4.3 Higher order charge current density 54

4.4 Geometric description of a point charged particle and other charge configurations 54

4.5 Operator norms associated with generalized metrics 55

4.6 Definition of generalized electric and magnetic fields 55
4.7 Short distance behavior of the electromagnetic field 56
4.8 Analytic structure of the generalized electromagnetic fields 57
4.9 Physical interpretation of the generalized fields 58
4.10 Physical interpretation of $F = \langle {}^k\zeta(\bar{F})\rangle$ 59

5 The Lorentz-Dirac equation in the framework of higher order electromagnetic fields and maximal acceleration geometry 59

5.1 A simple derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac force equation 59
5.2 Rohrlich's derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac equation in the framework of higher order fields 61
5.3 Rohrlich's derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac equation with maximal acceleration 62

6 A equation of motion of a charged particle interacting with generalized electromagnetic fields 62

6.1 Derivation of the equation of motion 62
6.2 General properties of the equation (6.5) 65
6.3 Absence of un-physical solutions of the equation (6.5) 66
6.4 Compatibility with the covariant power radiation 67

7 The effective spacetime electrodynamics of generalized fields and charged particles 67

7.1 Theory of generalized electromagnetic fields (minimal extension) . . 67
7.2 Maxwell's equations for higher order fields and currents 69

8 Discussion 71

8.1 Brief discussion on the assumptions of the theory 71
8.2 Relation with other higher order field theories 73
8.3 Further developments 73

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

It is known that classical electrodynamics of point-charged particles suffers from severe problems when one considers the coupled dynamics of point-charged particles and their radiation field. In such circumstances, the theory makes un-physical predictions [30]. This makes the theory unsatisfactory and remaining of further explanation. One can argue that such problems are not relevant, since the advent of quantum field theory, classical field theories describing fundamental interactions should be considered as the *classical limit* of an appropriate quantum field theory. Therefore, one could expect that the unwanted problems of classical electromagnetic theory (divergent Coulomb fields, run away solutions and pre-accelerated solutions of the Lorentz-Dirac force equation [20]) to be cured in the framework of a convenient quantum theory. This point of view is supported by the fact that those unwanted effects of the classical theory are significant at scales where quantum effects become relevant.

Despite the fact that such problems make the classical theory unsatisfactory from a theoretical viewpoint, the development of a quantum field theory able to overcome them is yet to be realized. The situation is further complicated by the absence of a well-defined regime of validity for the classical theory; without the security of a *valid* standard classical electromagnetic theory up to the energy scale where quantum effects become relevant, a top-down approach to constructing a quantum theory is inherently problematic.

In addition to the theoretical consequences of a problem-free classical theory, practical implications may be found in accelerator science and in modeling very dense, non-neutral, relativistic plasmas. The problem of the validity of classical electrodynamics is therefore one of relevance for current technologies. Therefore, one can conclude the still relevance of the foundations of the classical electromagnetic theory.

One proposed solution to the foundational problems of classical electromagnetism was detailed by Landau and Lifshitz [34] and cast in the framework of singular perturbation theory (and developed thereafter) by H. Spohn [44, 45]. Despite the success of some convenience of this second order differential equation in describing the dynamics of a point-charged particle (instead of the third order Dirac equation obtained from Dirac's theory [20]), the theory is still laden with theoretical difficulties. The starting point in Landau-Lifshitz theory is the Lorentz-Dirac equation, which is substituted by a more convenient yet *equivalent* equation. This procedure is seemingly ad-hoc (one starts from a differential equation which is physically unacceptable) and does not appeal to *fundamental principles.* Furthermore, it is unclear whether pre-accelerated solutions can be obtained from the Landau-Lifshitz equation. Although these deficiencies may be overcome by future theoretical developments, one cannot be sure a priori whether this will be achieved within the framework of standard classical electromagnetic theory.

Another solution was proposed by R. P. Feynman and J. A. Wheeler [22]. In the Feynman-Wheeler theory, the electromagnetic field is not fundamental, but an appropriate mathematical construction to deal with charged particles and instantaneous interactions between them, described by a combination of the advanced and retarded electromagnetic potentials. Although this theory is free from the problem of divergent Coulomb fields for point particles, we uphold the notion that the inclusion of the electromagnetic field within a theory is useful in describing classical electromagnetic phenomena. The support for this idea stems from the fact that the electromagnetic field is gauge invariant, while the electromagnetic potential is not. Additionally, in principle at least, the electromagnetic field is measurable by its effect on point-charged particles.

Without being exhaustive, it is evident that the current frameworks for classical electrodynamics are not entirely satisfactory. The experimental difficulties in testing fundamental questions of theories of classical electrodynamics, particularly in relation to the problems described before, partially explain the lack of a solution to the foundational problems of classical electrodynamics. It is therefore reasonable to investigate new perspectives if they can produce experimentally testable consequences.

In this work we present a theory of generalized higher order fields and we apply it to classical electrodynamics, to find a theory free from the problems of run away solutions and pre-accelerated solutions of the Dirac type and possible any other type of pre-accelerated solution. Motivated by experimental testability, the formalism for our theory is based on a *phenomenological description* of the electromagnetic field F, as determined by its effect on point-charged particles. Point-charged particles are characterized by certain curves on the space-time M which we can interpreted as the world-line curves of point-charged particles interacting with the field that we want to measure.

1.2 Criticism of the notions of exterior electromagnetic field and point test particle

In describing the behavior of a point-charged *test particle* influenced by the action of an external field, a typical strategy one could adopt is described in the following. One starts with the hypothesizes that the *test particle* will only 'see' the external field that we wish to measure. The standard description of the trajectory of the test particle is then obtained as a solution to the Lorentz force equation, determined by the external field. Such a naïve approach, based on experimental determination of the evolution of the test particle, would however yield an inaccurate description of the external field. This is because an accelerating charged particle radiates electromagnetic waves, and this radiation of energy-momentum would have a twofold effect on the motion of the test particle. Firstly, the *total* electromagnetic field would now be a linear combination of the external and radiation fields, as opposed to the sole external field. Secondly, the radiation of energy by the test particle would change its energy-momentum four-vector, thereby producing a dynamical effect on the motion of the test particle. Since the motion of the test particle is determined by the total field (rather than the sole external field), this suggests that the above notion of a test particle is not accurate enough to describe the behavior of charged particles in external electromagnetic fields.

Let us focus our attention initially on the related issue of how an electromagnetic field is defined in terms of physical measurements on the motion of point-charged particles (note we have replaced the denomination of 'test particle' with 'point-charged particle'). The discussion of the previous paragraph indicates that the motion of a charged particle is affected not only by the external field, but also by the radiation of the particle emitted as it accelerates. Therefore, the notion of defining an *external electromagnetic field* based on the measurement of the motion of test particles is not as clear-cut as we would like, since it cannot be characterized by measurements on the motion of charged particles without a complete description of the internal field. Both the point particle and the total field form a coupled dynamical system. In such systems it is difficult to abstract a notion of an external electromagnetic field that is consistent with a phenomenological characterization. The notion of an external electromagnetic field, and indeed of an electromagnetic field in general, requires revision. Further, we observe that it is natural to interpret the standard theory of classical electrodynamics as an effective theory. With this interpretation in mind, the notion of an external field must appear along with an associated notion of a test particle. In addition, a covariant notion of weak-strong fields should be possible [2].

1.3 A theory of higher order electromagnetic field

In order to describe the classical electrodynamics of point charged particles with electromagnetic fields, a modification of the notion of electromagnetic field can be useful. We propose that the description of an electromagnetic field should depend not only on the macroscopic source, but also on the state of motion of the charged particle which is used in each particular measurement setting. The motion of the particle is not prescribed a priori, but only assumed to exists and be regular in the domain of definition, which, on a classical level are reasonable assumptions. We then follow *fundamental principles* to obtain a mathematical formalism for the electromagnetic field, the equation of motion of the point-charged particle and the equation of evolution for the fields. The guiding principles when pursuing this strategy are as follows:

1. A minimal extension of the notion of a field. We think that a formalism capable of accommodating the dynamical system of point charged particles interacting with electromagnetic fields can be constructed if the electromagnetic field and other fields are described as sections of certain sub-bundles of *higher order jet-bundles* over the space-time manifold M. In particular, the generalization of the notion of a field introduces degrees of freedom in such a way that one can obtain consistent dynamics of particles and fields. This procedure is performed in a minimal way, introducing the minimal number of new degrees of freedom, attempting to be as conservative as possible in the process of generalization.

2. *Geometry of maximal acceleration.* In general relativity, the geometry of the space-time is dynamical. On the other hand, if the modified electromagnetic field enters in Einstein's equations, then in an analogous way the substitute for

---

[2] The pair (particle, external field) is a convenient representation if the external field has a much stronger effect than the radiative-reaction in the motion of the test particle. A notion for *strong* or *week* field can be introduced in a covariant way using the norm-operator associated with the Riemannian metric determined by an observer [29].

the metric field needs to be formulated in the same framework of higher order jet bundles. Therefore, the substitute of the space-time metric tensor will be a tensor defined on higher order bundles over the space-time manifold M. One way to achieve this is by using geometries of maximal acceleration. This provides a minimum extension such that the requirements third to five bellow are fulfilled. Conversely, a description of geometries with maximal acceleration requires the use of generalized metrics, with coefficients living on the jet bundle $J^2_0(M)$. This can be seen as a justification of the formalism of higher order fields.

3. We assume that the theory is an effective theory, in the sense that it depends on a small parameter in such a way that in the limit when such parameter goes to zero, one obtains the standard classical Maxwell-Lorentz theory. This parameter is related to the inverse square of the maximal covariant acceleration described in the point before. However, we do not discuss a particular mechanism producing the maximal acceleration and only general considerations are presented.

4. The equation of motion of the test particles must be a second order ordinary differential equation. This is a requirement that we follow, in order to avoid from the outset the problems that plague the standard formulation of classical mechanics. This principle is very restrictive, as we will see.

5. Conservation of the energy-momentum of the system. This implies that the loss of energy-momentum of the particle must be compensated for by its emitted radiation, following a covariant Larmor formula [30, 42].

We present a theory where all the physical fields (electromagnetic excitation, electromagnetic field, density currents and generalized metrics) have coefficients on higher order jet bundles over the space-time manifold M[3]. A maximal covariant acceleration is introduced, providing a book-keeping parameter for the theory. We show that in the limit of infinite maximal proper acceleration, there is a convenient definition of external field and test particle which recovers the standard notions.

As result of our analysis of the extension of electromagnetic fields to higher order jet bundles on the space-time manifold M and with point particles moving with bounded speed and acceleration, we derive an effective theory living on M for point-charged particles and electromagnetic fields such that it does not contain some of the pathologies of the standard classical theory. In particular, the electromagnetic fields are described by a set of equations analogous to Maxwell's equations, whereas the point-charged particle is described by equation (6.6) (or in its normal coordinate version form, eq. (6.5)), which is of second order and does not suffer most of the problems found with the Lorentz-Dirac equation. The effective full dynamics of fields and point-charged particles is described by equations (6.6) and the Maxwell equations (7.7), (7.10) together with the charge conservation law (7.11).

Our considerations will involve localized charged particles with fixed charge e and mass m. The electromagnetic media will be the *vacuum*, and therefore we will consider permittivity and permeability are constants living on the peace-time manifold M. The study of other more convenient media and charge distributions will be postponed to subsequent investigations.

---

[3] An alternative description to such objects is as sections of $\Lambda^p(J^k_0(M))$ that are horizontal, in the sense that will be indicated later.

1.4 Structure of the work

In this paper we explore a classical electrodynamic theory with electromagnetic fields to be sections of the bundle $\Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$. These are differential forms over M that, when applied to sections of ΓTM gives a section of $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$. In *section 2* such differential forms are introduced. Particular attention is payed in the case of generalized metric, since it will be of relevance to the construction of *geometries of maximal acceleration*. The fundamental notion of non-linear connection that we need to define natural objects in some vector bundles is also discussed. We describe the fundamental geometric and cohomological notions of generalized forms that required in later developments. In *section 3* the notion and fundamental properties of maximal covariant acceleration geometry are briefly presented. Maximal covariant acceleration introduces a natural perturbation parameter (the inverse of the square of the norm of the maximal covariant acceleration), which is fundamental for our treatment and will eventually forbid run-away solutions in a natural way. The generalized higher order fields are introduced in *section 4* from the cohomological perspective discussed in *section 2*. Also, we discuss the behavior of the singularities of the fields. The combination of the cohomology theory of *section 2* with the analytical structure that we assume for the electromagnetic fields provides an unambiguous way of generalize the notion of electromagnetic field in *section 4*. In *section 5* the Lorentz-Dirac equation is discussed in the standard framework of classical electrodynamics, in the new setting of generalized fields and in the contest of geometries of maximal acceleration. In particular, we analyze a simple way to obtain the Lorentz-Dirac equation, as was discussed by Rohrlich [42] in each of the different frameworks. In *section 6* a second order differential equation describing the motion of a charged particle is obtained and its basic properties discussed. The deduction is based strongly on the notions presented in *sections 3* and *section 5* and the method explained in *section 4*. We show that higher order fields, maximal acceleration and conservation of energy momentum are compatible. The resulting differential equation and is free of run-away and pre-accelerated solutions of Dirac's type. In *section 7* a complete set of differential equations for an effective electromagnetic theory on M are obtained. We calculate the corresponding oscillation frequencies. In *section 8*, the results of the paper are briefly discussed and some directions of further investigation are indicated.

1.5 Conventions

M is an n-dimensional, Hausdorff, second countable, smooth manifold (in applications to physics, $n = 4$. However, this restriction is not necessary for most of the developments that we present). That M has all these properties is only to assure the existence and uniqueness of natural geometric operators (basically, they justify the existence of exterior algebra of differential forms). An arbitrary point in the manifold M is denoted by Latin letters, usually by x or p. However, in the case of x, the same symbol will be used to designate its coordinates in a local coordinate chart on M. An arbitrary local coordinate chart on M is denoted by (U, x), where U is an open neighborhood. A curve on M will be a smooth map $x : I \longrightarrow M$, being I an interval of R. The distinction between the three different meanings of x will be clear from the context, although parameterized curves will often denoted by $x(\sigma)$ or by $x(t)$, indicating the parameter that they depend. Greek letters are used for space-time indices and run from 1 to n. Generally, smooth differential forms will also be denoted by Greek letters, except for electromagnetic fields, currents and potentials, where we follow the traditional notation and denote F, G, A, J. When considering fiber bundles over M, Indices of the fiber over x in the jet bundle are denoted by capital Latin letters. For instance for fibers over x of the jet bundle $J^k_0(M)$ they run from $A = 1, ..., nk$. Einstein's summation convention is used, if anything else is not stated. In some occasions we use multi-index notation, in order to simplify some expressions. The manifold M is equipped with a pseudo-Riemannian metric η. However, for physical applications it will have signature $(-1, 1, ..., 1)$. Even in some more concrete applications, the space-time manifold will be four dimensional and will have signature $(-1, 1, 1, 1)$. In this case, when a $3 + 1$ decomposition is possible, three dimensional objects are indicated by arrowed vectors like $\vec{A}$.

2 Differential geometry of jet bundles and cohomology of generalized differential forms

In this *section* we introduce the notions generalized tensors and generalized differential forms that we will use later. Firstly, a short introduction to k-jets bundles $J^k_0(M)$ is necessary, since the geometric objects that we will consider are constructed on such bundles. Then a relevant class of connections defined on the k-jet bundle are explained. Once we have choose one of such connections, the notion of generalized tensors and forms is given. It consists on tensor along maps on M with values on the module of functions $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$. The justification to introduce such sophisticated objects is based on physical considerations and will be explained in later sections. Just say here that it allows a notion of electromagnetic field which is capable to accommodate the changes produce by radiating point charged particles.

We will show that basic notions of differential geometry can be transplanted to the framework of generalized tensors and forms. For instance, a notion of generalized metric is introduced as generalized tensor, as well as associated objects as distance, isometries, Hodge operator as well as the fundamentals of a causal theory (for Lorentzian signature). The foundations of the Cartan's calculus for generalized forms are explained. With a notion of generalized metric and the Cartan's calculus for generalized forms at hand, the fundamental results of the cohomology of generalized differential forms are obtained. In particular, integration along the fiber implies a version of *Thom's isomorphism theorem.* Although motivated by physical applications in later *sections*, the cohomology results can be considered independently of those applications and indeed can be applied to other problems in physics. We end this *section* with a definition of integration of generalized forms.

2.1 Jet bundles and natural lifts

Jet theory is a natural framework for the study of the geometry of ordinary and partial differential equations (see for instance for a introduction to jet theory [10, 19, 32, 43]). Given a smooth curve $x : I \longrightarrow M$, the set of derivatives $(x(0),\, \frac{dx}{d\sigma},\, \frac{dx}{d\sigma}|_0,\, ...,\, \frac{d^kx}{d\sigma^k}|_0)$ determines a point in the space of jets of curves $J^k_0(p)$ in a neighborhood of the point $p = x(0) \in M$,

$$J^k_0(p) := \left\{(x(0),\, \frac{dx}{d\sigma}|_0,\, ...,\, \frac{d^kx}{d\sigma^k}|_0),\ \forall \mathcal{C}^k\, x : I \longrightarrow M,\, x(0) = p \in M,\, 0 \in I\right\}.$$

The jet bundle $J^k_0(M)$ over M is the disjoint union

$$J^k_0(M) := \bigsqcup_{x \in M} J^k_0(x).$$

The projection map is

$${}^k\pi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow M, \quad (x(0),\, \frac{dx}{d\sigma}\Big|_0,\, \frac{d^2x}{d\sigma^2}\Big|_0, ...,\, \frac{d^kx}{d\sigma^k}\Big|_0) \mapsto x(0).$$

The fiber over $p \in M$ $J^k_0(p) = {}^k\pi^{-1}(p)$ is a manifold of dimension nk. Local coordinates on the fiber $J^k_0(p)$ are induced from the local coordinate system (U, x) over M in the way that a natural system of local coordinates is $(x(\sigma),\, \frac{dx}{d\sigma},\, \frac{d^2x}{d\sigma^2}, ...,\, \frac{d^kx}{d\sigma^k})|_{\sigma_0 = 0}$. In a similar way, a natural system of local coordinates of a point in $J^k_0(M)$ is denoted by $(x^1, ..., x^n, y^1, ..., y^{nk})$. The linear map ${}^k\pi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow M$ is differentiable and the differential of the projection ${}^k\pi_u$ at $u \in {}^k\pi^{-1}(x)$ is the linear map

$$({}^k\pi_*)_u : T_uJ^k_0(M) \longrightarrow T_xM.$$

We will denote by ${}^k\pi_*$ the projection $({}^k\pi_*) : TJ^k_0(M) \longrightarrow TM$ such that at each u it is the linear map $({}^k\pi_*)_u$.

Given a curve $x : I \to M$, the k-lift is the curve ${}^kx : I \to J^k_0(M)$ such that the following diagram commutes,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& J^k_0(M) \arrow[d, "{}^k\pi"] \\
I \arrow[ur, "{}^kx"] \arrow[r, "x"] & M.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Each point on the lift ${}^kx : I \to J^k_0(M)$ has local coordinates given by $(x(\sigma),\, \frac{dx(\sigma)}{d\sigma}, ...,\, \frac{d^kx(\sigma)}{d\sigma^k})$, where σ is the parameter of the curves $x : I \to M$ and ${}^kx : I \to J^k_0(M)$.

There is also the notion of lift of a tangent vectors and smooth functions:

1. Let $X \in T_xM$. A lift ${}^kl_u(X)$ at $u \in {}^k\pi^{-1}(x)$ is a tangent vector at u such that $d\,{}^k\pi({}^kl_u(X)) = X$.

2. Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ the algebra of real smooth functions over $J^k_0(M)$. Then there is defined the lift of a function $f \in \mathcal{F}(M)$ to $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ by ${}^k\pi^*(f)(u) = f(x),\, \forall u \in {}^k\pi^{-1}(x)$.

Remark 2.1 $J^k_0(M)$ is not a vector bundle over M, except in the case $k=1$, where $J^k_0(M) \simeq TM$. We will use vector bundle cohomology results later on and we will see why this is convenient.

The kernel of $({}^k\pi_*)_x$ at $x \in M$ is the vector space

$$ {}^k\mathcal{V}_x := ({}^k\pi_*)^{-1}(0_x). $$

where 0_x is the zero vector in T_xM. Then vertical bundle over M is

$$ {}^k\mathcal{V} := \bigsqcup_{x \in M} {}^k\mathcal{V}_x \tag{2.1} $$

and the vertical bundle over $J^k_0(M)$ is

$$ {}^k\pi_V : {}^k\mathcal{V} \longrightarrow J^k_0(M). $$

${}^k\mathcal{V}$ is a real vector bundle over $J^k_0(M)$, since it is the kernel of ${}^k\pi_*$. The composition of ${}^k\pi_V$ with ${}^k\pi$ determines also a real vector bundle over M,

$$ {}^k\pi \circ {}^k\pi_V : {}^k\mathcal{V} \longrightarrow M. $$

One can introduce the notation ${}^k\tilde{\pi}_V = {}^k\pi \circ {}^k\pi_V$.

2.2 Connections on $TJ^k_0(M)$ and a covariant derivative on TM

Let us recall the notion of general connection on an arbitrary fiber bundle $\pi_{\mathcal{E}} : \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow M$ (see for instance [32]). The vertical bundle is $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{E} := ker((\pi_{\mathcal{E}})_*)$. A connection is then a map

$$ \Phi_{\mathcal{E}} : TM \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}\mathcal{E} $$

such that

1. $\Phi^2_{\mathcal{E}} = \Phi_{\mathcal{E}}$,
2. $Im\,\Phi = \mathcal{V}\mathcal{E}$.

For $h_{\mathcal{E}} = (Id - \Phi_{\mathcal{E}})$, one has that $h^2_{\mathcal{E}} = h_{\mathcal{E}}$ and the following decomposition holds globally,

$$ T\mathcal{E} = \Phi_{\mathcal{E}}(T\mathcal{E}) \oplus h_{\mathcal{E}}(T\mathcal{E}) := \mathcal{V}\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{H}\mathcal{E}. $$

The distribution $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{E}$ is the horizontal bundle. Therefore, for each $u \in \mathcal{E}$ there is the unique decomposition

$$ T_u\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{H}_u\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{V}_u\mathcal{E}. $$

Given the connection $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{E}$, the horizontal lift of a vector field $X \in \Gamma\,TM$ is a horizontal field ${}^hX \in \Gamma\,\mathcal{H}\mathcal{E}$ such that ${}^k\pi_*({}^hX) = X$.

Definition 2.2 *A connection on* ${}^k\pi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow M$ *is a global splitting*

$$TJ^k_0(M) = \mathcal{V}J^k_0(M) \oplus \mathcal{H}J^k_0(M),$$

with $\mathcal{V}_u J^k_0(M) = {}^k\mathcal{V}_u = ker({}^k\pi_*)_u$ *for each* $u \in J^k_0(M)$.

We will denote by ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}J^k_0(M)$ to the horizontal distributions.

The objective of this and following *sub-sections* is to show the existence of connections on $J^k_0(M)$ related with a standard connection $\mathcal{H}_D \hookrightarrow TTM$ on TM, which is determined by the Levi-Civita connection D of the semi-Riemannian metric η on M. In order to introduce the connection $\mathcal{H}_D$ on TM, let us consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} TTM \arrow[r, "\pi_2"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & TM \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ TM \arrow[r, "\pi"] & M \end{tikzcd} \tag{2.2}$$

and let $\mathcal{V} = ker(\pi_1) \subset TTM$ be the vertical sub-bundle. The vertical lift of a vector field is canonically defined [16] and is

$${}^v l : TM \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}, \quad \hat{X} \mapsto ({}^v\hat{X})_{u=(x,y)} := \frac{d(x, y + tX)}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}.$$

Let us fix the connection $\mathcal{H}_D$ as the distribution of TTM determined by the conditions [16, 17],

1. It is torsion free,
$$[{}^hX, {}^vY] - [{}^hY, {}^vX] - {}^v[X, Y] = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

2. The geodesic spray $\mathcal{S}$ of the Riemannian connection D determines the horizontal lift by the formula
$${}^hX_u := \frac{1}{2}([{}^vX, \mathcal{S}]_u + ({}^cX)_u), \quad X \in T_xM,\ u \in \pi^{-1}. \tag{2.4}$$

The horizontal lift (2.4) is linked to a horizontal distribution [16],

Proposition 2.3 *The set* $\{({}^hX)_u,\ X \in T_xM,\ u \in \pi^{-1}(x),\ x \in M\}$ *determines a vector space of sections that defines a connection* $\mathcal{H}_D$ *on* TM.

The connection $\mathcal{H}_D$ has associated the projection operator $h_D : TTM \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_D$. Together with additional conditions involving the notion of torsion, one can determine a unique horizontal distribution $\mathcal{H}_D = Im(h_D)$. Since $dim(\mathcal{V}) = n$, one has that $\mathcal{H}_D = n$. The horizontal lift of an arbitrary vector field $X \in \Gamma TM$ is denoted by ${}^hX \in \Gamma TTM$. Given $\hat{X} \in \Gamma TTM$, its horizontal component is denoted by ${}^h\hat{X}$.

Example 2.4 Let (M, η) be a Lorentzian space-time. Given an holonomic local frame $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu},\ \mu = 1, ..., n\}$ the connection coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection D are given by the expression

$$(D_{\partial_\nu}\partial_\rho)^\mu := \gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\mu s}(\frac{\partial \eta_{s\nu}}{\partial x^\rho} - \frac{\partial \eta_{\rho\nu}}{\partial x^s} + \frac{\partial \eta_{s\rho}}{\partial x^\nu})$$

for $\mu, \nu, \rho, s = 1, ..., n$. Then one can introduce the homomorphism the homomorphism

$$N : TM \longrightarrow TTM, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \mapsto N^\nu{}_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}.$$

such that the projector h_D is given by

$$h_D : TTM \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_D, \quad \hat{X} \mapsto (Id - N)(\hat{X}).$$

Then h_D is determined by the components of N,

$$N^\mu{}_\nu(u) = \gamma^\mu{}_{\nu\rho}(x)\, y^\rho \tag{2.5}$$

for $\mu, \nu, \rho = 1, ..., n$.

An induced tangent basis for $T_u M$ is given by the distribution

$$\left\{ \frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_u, \frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial y^n}|_u \right\}, \quad \frac{\delta}{\delta x^\nu}|_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu}|_u - N^\mu{}_\nu(u) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}|_u \tag{2.6}$$

for $\mu, \nu = 1, ..., n$. The set of local sections

$$\{ \frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_u, \, u \in TU \} \tag{2.7}$$

generates the local horizontal distribution $\mathcal{H}_D|_U$, while the set of local sections

$$\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial y^A}|_u, u \in TU \} \tag{2.8}$$

generates the local vertical distribution $\mathcal{V}|_U$.

Given a connection on TM, there is associated a covariant derivative on M, defined in local coordinates by the expression

$$(D_{\dot{x}}\, Z)^\sigma = \ddot{x}^\sigma + N^\sigma{}_\rho((x, Z))\dot{x}^\rho, \quad u = (x, \dot{x}) \in TM, \, Z \in \Gamma TTM. \tag{2.9}$$

The derivatives are performed respect to σ (in this case, an affine parameter) . The geodesic equation for the linear connection D is given as the curve on M solution of the differential equation

$$D_{\dot{x}}\, \dot{x} = 0, \tag{2.10}$$

Equation (2.10) corresponds to the geodesic equation of the pseudo-Riemannian metric η.

2.3 Induced connections on $J^k_0 M$ from connections on TM

Given a connection $\mathcal{H}$ on TM, we can show the existence of connections ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$ related with $\mathcal{H}$. The construction resembles the *induced connection* of the references [31, 32]. The connections ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ will be used in the construction of geometric objects and some relevant natural operators on $J^k_0(M)$.

Let us consider the commutative diagram,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
J_0^k(M) \arrow[r, "{}^k pr"] \arrow[d, "{}^k\pi"'] & TM \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
M \arrow[r, "id"] & M.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.11}$$

The commutative diagram (2.11) induces a commutative diagram for each ${}^k x \in J_0^k(M)$, $(x, y) \in TM$ and $x \in M$ with $pr({}^k x) = (x, y)$ and $\pi(x, y) = x$,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_{{}^k x} J_0^k(M) \arrow[r, "{}^k pr_*"] \arrow[d, "{}^k\pi_*"'] & T_{(x,y)}TM \arrow[d, "\pi_*"] \\
T_x M \arrow[r, "id"] & T_x M.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.12}$$

Lemma 2.5 *Let us consider a distribution* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}} \subset TJ_0^k(M)$ *such that* $pr_*({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \subset \mathcal{H}$ *and that the diagram (2.12) commutes. Then it holds that* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}} \cap {}^k\mathcal{V} = 0$.

Proof. If the vector field $\hat{X}_0 \in {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and is vertical, then $({}^k\pi_*)(\hat{X}_0) = 0$. The commutative diagrams (2.12) imply that $pr_*(\hat{X}_0) \in \mathcal{H}_D$ and $\pi_*(pr_*(\hat{X}_0)) = 0$. Therefore, $pr_*(\hat{X}_0) = 0$, since the only horizontal vector U such that $pr_*(U)_=0$ is the null vector. $\square$

Lemma 2.6 *Let us consider* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ *such that* $pr_*({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \subset \mathcal{H}$ *and that the diagrams (2.12) commute. Then* $dim({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \leq dim(M) = n$.

Proof. Assume that it has dimension $n + 1$. Then there is a basis $\{\hat{X}_1, ..., \hat{X}_n, \hat{Z}\}$ of ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $\hat{X}_i = X_i$ for each $i = 1, ..., n$. Therefore,

$$pr_*(\hat{Z}) = a^i X_i = a^i \, pr_*(\hat{X}_i) = pr_*(a^i \, \hat{X}_i),$$

from what follows that $pr_*(\hat{Z} - a^i \, \hat{X}_i) = 0$. Since diagrams (2.12) are commutative, it follows that $\hat{Z} - a^i \, \hat{X}_i$ is vertical. Therefore, it must be zero (by *lemma* 2.5). $\square$

Proposition 2.7 *Let us consider* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m$ *of maximal dimension such that* $pr_*({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \subset \mathcal{H}$. *Then it has dimension n.*

Proof. We have that $dim(TJ_0^k(M)) = n(k + 1)$, $dim(ker({}^k pr_*)) = nk$. On the other hand, ${}^k pr_*$ is surjective. Therefore, $dim(Im(pr_*)) = n$. Assume that there is a $X_0 \in \mathcal{H}_m$ such that it is not the image of some $\hat{X}_0 \in {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$. This is in contradiction with the following facts (just counting dimensions):

1. ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m$ is of maximal dimension,
2. $pr_*({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m) \subset \mathcal{H}$,
3. The projection pr_* is surjective.

Therefore, it follows that $dim({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m) = n$. □

Theorem 2.8 *A distribution* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m$ *of maximal dimension such that* $pr_*({}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \subset \mathcal{H}$ *and that the diagrams (2.12) commute is a connection on* $J^k_0(M)$.

Proof. Let ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m$ a maximal distribution of dimension n. As we showed in *lemma* 2.5 ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m \cap {}^k\mathcal{V} = 0$. This shows that $TJ^k_0(M) = {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_m \oplus {}^k\mathcal{V}$. □

Definition 2.9 *Given* $\mathcal{H}$ *a connection on* TM. *A connection* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ *on* $J^k_0(M)$ *as in theorem 2.8 will be called an induced connection on* $J^k_0(M)$.

We consider an induced connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$ which is induced from the connection $\mathcal{H}_D$, determined from the Levi-Civita connection D. We note that *theorem* 2.8 does not fix the connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, but only shows the existence of such connections. Indeed, because of the difference between the dimensionality between $T_{{}^kx}J^k_0(M)$ and $T_{(x,y)}TM$, it is not possible to fix the connection on that way and a bunch of connections exists that full-fill *theorem* 2.8. However, one can characterize such connections,

Proposition 2.10 *Let us consider two connections* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$, ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ *constructed as in theorem 2.8. If* ${}^{h_1}X \in {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1|_{{}^kx}$ *and* ${}^{h_2}X \in {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2|_{{}^kx}$ *are the corresponding horizontal lifts of* $X \in T_xM$ *such that* $pr_*({}^{h_1}X - {}^{h_2}X) = 0$, *then* ${}^{h_1}X - {}^{h_2}X =$ *is vertical.*

Proof. It is a direct consequence of the fact that the diagrams (2.12) commute. □

The following notion captures when a property is independent of the connection used,

Definition 2.11 *Equivariant relations.*

1. *Two connections* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$ *and* ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ *are equivariant iff* ${}^{h_1}X - {}^{h_2}X \in {}^k\mathcal{V}$.
2. *A property is equivariant if it is formulated using the connections appearing in 2.8 and is true for any of such connections.*

If we denote by ${}^k\mathbf{H}$ the set of connections as in *theorem* 2.8, it is clear the following

Proposition 2.12 *Definition 2.11 induces an equivalence relation in* ${}^k\mathbf{H}$.

Each induced connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ has associated a projection map $\hat{h}_k$,

$$\hat{h}_k : TJ^k_0(M) \longrightarrow {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$$

with the property that $(\hat{h}_k)^2 = \hat{h}_k$.

Remark 2.13 1. One way to define a connection on $J^k_0(M)$ is by using a semi-spray of order k plus additional conditions on the variation equations [10]. However, for the problem that we are interested on this paper (the dynamics of point charged particles with the electromagnetic field), we do not have at hand any natural semi-spray of order k which is free of pathological solutions. Indeed, we have two possible semi-sprays defined in the problem. The first one corresponds to the Lorentz-Dirac equation. This is a spray of third order $k = 3$. However, the Lorentz-Dirac spray is not physically acceptable: it is well known that it contains un-physical solutions. The second natural spray corresponds to the geodesic equation of the pseudo-Riemannian metric η. This is a spray of second order $k = 2$. It determines geodesics describing the dynamics of free point charged particles.

2. Kaluza-Klein dimensional reduction theories does not provides a natural spray to define a convenient connection. That reduction reproduces Lorentz force equation, that although brings to the game several connections (see for instance [35, 36, 24]), it does not take into account radiation reaction effects.

In view of the above remarks we need to keep in mind that the equation governing the dynamics of a point charged particle is not necessarily a (semi)-spray. This will be indeed the case.

Given a connection ${}^k\hat{H}$ on $J^k_0(M)$, the local connection coefficients of the endomorphism N in the natural basis

$$\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1},...,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^n},\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1},...,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{nk}}\right\}. \tag{2.13}$$

are $\{N^A{}_\mu,\ \mu = 1,...,\ A = 1,...,nk\}$. However, they are not completely determined by the above construction. Note that we are not able to specify the connection by *theorem* 2.8. In this sense, let us adopt a particular type of the connections that 2.8 stipulates to exists. Then there is a splitting of any local frame of $TJ^k_0(M)$ such that the horizontal distribution is locally generated by

$$\left\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_x,...,\frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_x,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_x,...,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{nk}}|_x\right\},\quad \frac{\delta}{\delta x^\nu}|_x=\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu}|_x-N^A{}_\nu\frac{\partial}{\partial y^A}|_x \tag{2.14}$$

with $\nu = 1,...,n$, $A = 1,...,nk$. Therefore, the functions kn^2 functions $N^A{}_\mu(x,y)$ determines the connection in the given coordinate system. From *theorem* 2.8 n^2 of those functions are fixed. Therefore, there are still $(k-1)n^2$ to be fixed by imposing additional conditions.

The vertical distribution is generated locally by the local frame,

$$\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_x,...,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{nk}}|_x, x\in U\subset M\right\}.$$

A way to impose conditions on the connection is by considering the following type of connections,

Definition 2.14 *A vertical p-form is such that* $\omega_v(...{}^h\hat{X}_i,...) = 0$ *for any horizontal vector field* ${}^h\hat{X}\in{}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$.

A local frame of vertical forms is determined by exterior product of vertical 1-forms

$$\delta y^A = dy^A + N^A{}_\nu\, dx^\nu,\quad \nu = 1,...,n,\quad A = 1,...,nk, \tag{2.15}$$

where the dual co-frame of 1-forms $\{dx^1,...,dx^n,dy^1,...,dy^{nk}\}$ defined by the relations

$$dx^i(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}) = \delta^i_j,\quad dx^i(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^A}) = 0,$$

$$dx^A(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}) = 0, \quad dy^A(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^B}) = \delta^A_B, \quad i,j = 1,...,n, \; A,B = 1,...,nk.$$

The proof of the following proposition is direct,

Proposition 2.15 *The notion of vertical form is equivariant.*

Remark 2.16 This is not in general true in the case of vertical tensors: a vertical tensor can depend on the definition of the connection.

A tensor field of type (p,q) T is a section of the bundle $T^{(p,q)}J^k_0(M)$. Given a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$, one can define the notions of horizontal and vertical tensors of any order.

Example 2.17 A tensor field T of type $(2,0)$ is a section of the bundle $T^{(2,0)}J^k_0(M)$. Locally, the sections of $T^{(2,0)}J^k_0(M)$ are spanned (with coefficients on $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$) by the tensor product of elements of the frame $\{e_1({}^kx),...,e_{n(k+1)}({}^kx)\}$

$$T^{(2,0)}J^k_0(M) = \; span\Big\{e_i({}^kx)\otimes\, e_j({}^kx),\; i,j = 1,...,n(k+1)\Big\}.$$

If there is defined a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ as in *theorem* 2.8, the tensor bundle of $(0,2)$ horizontal tensors is locally spanned as

$$T^{(2,0)}_h J^k_0(M) = \; span\left\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^\mu}\Big|_{{}^kx}\otimes\,\frac{\delta}{\delta x^\nu}\Big|_{{}^kx},\; \mu,\nu = 1,...,n\right\}.$$

Similarly, the tensor bundle of $(2,0)$ vertical tensors is locally spanned as

$$T^{(2,0)}_h J^k_0(M) = \; span\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^A}\Big|_{{}^kx}\otimes\,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^B}\Big|_{{}^kx},\; A,B = 1,...,nk\right\}.$$

The bundle over $J^k_0(M)$ of *hv* tensors of type $(1,1)$ is locally spanned

$$T^{(1,1)}_h J^k_0(M) = \; span\left\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^\mu}\Big|_{{}^kx}\otimes\,\frac{\partial}{\partial y^A}\Big|_{{}^kx},\; \mu = 1,...,n,\; A = 1,...,nk\right\}.$$

One can consider an horizontal $(1,1)$ tensor, that generically will have the following expression in local coordinates

$$T({}^kx) = T^i{}_j({}^kx)\frac{\delta}{\delta x^i}\Big|_{{}^kx}\otimes\,\delta x^j\Big|_{{}^kx},\; T^i{}_j({}^kx)\in\,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)).$$

Horizontal p-forms can be spanned locally in a similar way

A 2-form horizontal can be expressed in local coordinates as

$$\omega({}^kx) = \,\omega_{ij}({}^kx)dx^i|_{{}^kx}\wedge dx^j|_{{}^kx}.$$

Note that horizontal forms does not depend on the specific connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ that we can choose.

The tensor product of horizontal tensors is an horizontal tensor. In a similar way, the exterior product of horizontal forms is an horizontal form. One of the non-trivial results that we will show bellow is that there is a notion of horizontal exterior derivative, for which definition we need a connection on $J^k_0(M)$.

2.4 Generalized forms and tensors fields

Let $J^k_0(M)$ be the k-jet bundle over M and η a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M. Let us consider a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$ as in *theorem* 2.8.

Definition 2.18 *Let $pr : T^{(p,q)}J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ be a tensor bundle over $J^k_0(M)$. A tensor along the curve ${}^kx : I \to M$ is a map $\hat{S} : I \longrightarrow T^{(p,q)}J^k_0(M)$ such for the curve ${}^kx : I \to M$, lift of the curve $x : I \to M$ to $J^k_0(M)$, the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & T^{(p,q)}J^k_0(M) \arrow[d, "pr"] \\
I \arrow[ur, "\hat{S}"] \arrow[r, "{}^kx"] & J^k_0(M).
\end{tikzcd}$$

A tensor $\hat{S}$ along the curve $x : I \to M$ is horizontal if it its value acting on any arbitrary vertical vector or vertical 1-form is zero. A tensor $\hat{S}$ is vertical if its value, acting on any horizontal vector is zero.

One defines in a similar way differential forms along the curve ${}^kx : I \to M$ as a map $\hat{\omega} : M \longrightarrow \Lambda^p J^k_0(M)$ such that the following diagram commutes,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \Lambda^p J^k_0(M) \arrow[d, "pr"] \\
I \arrow[ur, "\hat{\omega}"] \arrow[r, "{}^kx"] & J^k_0(M).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let us define the following projections:

$$\hat{h}_k : T^{(p,q)}(J^k_0(M)) \longrightarrow T^{(p,q)}_h(J^k_0(M))$$
$$T \mapsto \hat{h}_k(T)$$

such that on horizontal vectors and forms $T = \hat{h}_k(T)$, but if $\hat{h}_k(T)$ acting over any vertical vector or differential 1-form is zero. The horizontal tensor bundle is

$$T^{(p,q)}_h(J^k_0(M)) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$$

In a similar way one can define the horizontal forms bundle $\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M))$ and the corresponding projection

$$\hat{h}_k : \Lambda^k(J^k_0(M)) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M).$$

Definition 2.19 *(Weak definition of generalized tensors and forms)*

Let (M, η) be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold. A k-generalized (p,q)-tensor $\hat{S}$ is a map such that:

1. *To each timelike curve $x : I \to M$ associates a horizontal tensor $\hat{S} : I \longrightarrow T^{(p,q)}_h J^k_0(x(I))$ along ${}^kx : I \to M$ as in definition 2.18.*

2. If two lifted curves ${}^k x_1 : I \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ and ${}^k x_2 : I \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ intersect at the point ${}^k x(s_0) \in {}^k x_1 \subset {}^k x_2$, then the value at the intersection of the generalized tensor coincides,

$$\hat{S}({}^k x_1(s_0)) = \hat{S}({}^k x_2(s_0)). \tag{2.16}$$

3. It is horizontal, evaluated on any vertical vector or vertical 1-form is zero.

A k-generalized p-form is a map such that to each time-like curve $x : I \to M$ associates a horizontal differential form $\hat{\omega} : I \longrightarrow \Lambda^p_h J^k_0(x(I))$ along $x : I \to M$.

Therefore, given a curve $x : I \to M$ and the lift of the curve (with a prescribed base point) ${}^k x : I \to J^k_0(M)$ a k-generalized (p,q)-tensor associates a unique section of $T^{(p,q)}_h J^k_0(M)$ along the map ${}^k x : I \to J^k_0(M)$.

Remark 2.20 Since the definition of generalized tensor is quite elaborate, we provide some insight on the motivation for such definition:

1. The second condition 2.19 is related with *locality character* of physical fields.
2. We restrict to consider horizontal fields only, since they will have associated macroscopic flows across surfaces in some physical interpretations.

We will restrict our attention to causal curves $x : I \to M$ in 2.19 because its relevance for physical applications.

Definition 2.19 provides a notion of tensors along lifted curves to $J^k_0(M)$. However, this notion is not enough to define some natural operations on generalized tensors and generalized differential forms (in particular to consider exterior derivative operator). In order to be able to define such operations one needs to define on open neighborhoods of $J^k_0(M)$. One can achieve a more convenient definition of generalized field by considering fields over lifts to $J^k_0(M)$ of tubes in M. A way to construct convenient tubes is the following. Let

$$\Delta : I \times \Sigma^{n-1} \longrightarrow M,$$

be a congruence of curves such that the lift

$${}^k\Delta := \bigcup_{\delta \in \Sigma^{n-1}} {}^k\Delta(\cdot, \delta) \tag{2.17}$$

is a tube in $J^k_0(M)$ such that intersection between the lifted curves,

$$\Delta(\cdot, \delta_1) \cap \Delta(\cdot, \delta_2) = \emptyset.$$

Then $\Delta(I \times \Sigma^{n-1}) \subset M$ is a tube on M.

Definition 2.21 *(Strong definition of generalized tensors and forms) Let (M, η) be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold. A k-generalized (p,q)-tensor $\hat{S}$ is a map such that:*

1. To each tube $\Delta : I \times \Sigma^{n-1} \longrightarrow M$ associates a horizontal tensor along the lifted tube ${}^k\Delta$, which is a map $\hat{S} : I \longrightarrow T^{(p,q)}_h J^k_0(\Delta)$.

2. If two tubes intersect, the value of the tensor $\hat{S}$ coincides in the intersection,

$$\hat{S}({}^k\Delta_1) = \hat{S}({}^k\Delta_2), \text{ for any } {}^k x \in {}^k\Delta_1 \cap {}^k\Delta_2. \tag{2.18}$$

A k-generalized p-form is a map such that to each tube $\Delta : I \times \Sigma^{n-1} \longrightarrow M$ associates a horizontal differential form along the lifted ${}^k\Delta$, which is a map $\hat{S} : I \longrightarrow \Lambda^p J^k_0(\Delta)$.

Example 2.22 If $k = 1$, $\hat{S}$ is a standard tensor or form defined in a tube $\hat{S} \in \Gamma\, T^{(p,q)}\Delta$ along a curve $x : I \to M$. It is clear that the set of generalized tensors form a real vector space, that we denote by $T^{(p,q)}_h(J^k_0(M))$ (respectively, $\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M))$) for differential forms.

Remark 2.23 The notion of tube in $J^k_0(M)$ that we use assumes that there are non-intersections in the curves composing the tube. This is natural when dealing with local notions. However, it is not guaranteed the absence of intersections for arbitrary long tubes.

In the case that the manifold (M, η) is Lorentzian, one can specify to work with tubes which are composed by non space-like curves. Also interesting is the possibility to work with congruences of curves, solutions of a given differential equation on M. Then one needs to check that given an arbitrary point ${}^k x \in J^k_0(M)$, it can be surrounded by a tube composed by lifting to $J^k_0(M)$ local solutions of the differential equation.

2.5 Tensors and forms with values on $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$

Definition 2.24 *A generalized tensor T of type (p, q) with values on $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ is a smooth section of the bundle of $\mathcal{F}(M)$-linear homomorphisms*

$$T^{(p,q)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := Hom(T^*M \times ...^p... \times T^*M \times TM \times ...^q... \times TM,\, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))).$$

A p-form ω with values on $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ is a smooth section of the bundle of $\mathcal{F}(M)$-linear homomorphisms

$$\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := Hom(TM \times ...^p... \times TM,\, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))).$$

The case $\Gamma\,\Lambda^0(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$.

Given a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$, there is an alternative way to describe generalized tensors (for both weak and strong definitions of generalized tensors and forms). The connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ determines the horizontal lifts $T_xM \ni X \mapsto {}^hX \in T_{{}^kx}J^k_0(M)$ and $T^*_xM \ni \alpha \mapsto {}^h\alpha \in T^*_{{}^kx}J^k_0(M)$. Then the tensor $\hat{S}$ defines a $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$-multilineal form

$$\bar{S} : T^*M \times ...^p... \times T^*M \times TM \times ...^q...TM \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$$

$$(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_p,\, X_1, ..., X_q) \mapsto \hat{S}({}^h\alpha_1, ...,\, {}^h\alpha_p,\, {}^hX_1, ...,\, {}^hX_k, ...,\, {}^hX_q). \tag{2.19}$$

This rule determines the homomorphism

$$\phi : T_h^{(p,q)}(J_0^k(M)) \longrightarrow T^{(p,q)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))), \quad \hat{S} \mapsto \bar{S}. \tag{2.20}$$

There is a similar construction for generalized forms,

$$\phi : \Lambda_h^p(J_0^k(M)) \longrightarrow \Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))), \quad \hat{\omega} \mapsto \bar{\omega}. \tag{2.21}$$

such that it is an homomorphism of graded algebras,

$$\phi(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2) = \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2,\, \alpha_i \in \Lambda_h^{p_i}(J_0^k(M)).$$

The relation between definition 2.24 and this new alternative definition are given by the following two results,

Proposition 2.25 *The definition of tensor and forms $\mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))$-valued is equivariant.*

Proof. Given two equivalent connections as the specified in *theorem* 2.8, for any vector field $X \in \Gamma TM$, ${}^{h_1}X - {}^{h_2}X$ is vertical (similarly for the lifting of differential forms). Therefore, since the tensor $\hat{T}$ is horizontal,

$$\hat{T}({}^{h_1}\alpha_1, ..., {}^{h_1}\alpha_p, {}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_q) = \hat{T}({}^{h_2}\alpha_1, ..., {}^{h_2}\alpha_p, {}^{h_2}X_1, ..., {}^{h_2}X_q).$$

□

Proposition 2.26 *The homomorphisms (2.20) and (2.21) are $\mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))$ isomorphisms.*

Proof. Let us fix our attention in the first homomorphism (2.20). Since $\hat{S} \in T_h^{(p,q)}(J_0^k(M))$, it is horizontal and the fact that the horizontal lift is an injective homomorphism, we have that (2.20) is injective. To prove that it is also surjective, one can consider an arbitrary $\bar{S} \in \Gamma T^{(p,q)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)))$ defined at each point ${}^kx$ in the following way. For the horizontal $({}^h\alpha_i, ..., {}^h\alpha_p)$ 1-forms and horizontal $(X_1, ..., X_p)$ vector fields on M one has that,

$$\hat{S}({}^h\alpha_1, ..., {}^h\alpha_p, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_q)({}^kx) := \bar{S}({}^k\pi_*({}^h\alpha_1), ..., {}^k\pi_*({}^h\alpha_p), {}^k\pi_*({}^hX_1), ..., {}^k\pi_*({}^hX_q))(x); \tag{2.22}$$

for any other vectors and forms on $J_0^k(M)$ one has

$$\hat{S}(\beta_1, ..., \beta_p, Y_1, ..., Y_q) = 0, \quad \text{if any vector } Y \text{ or 1-form } \beta \text{ is vertical.}$$

This $\hat{S}$ is horizontal and such that $\phi(\hat{S}) = \bar{S}$. Therefore, ϕ is also surjective. Note that the computations are done pointwise. The localization property follows in a similar way as in *proposition 3.1* in [31]. □

Because of the equivalence 2.26, we will use each of the above notions

Any section of $Hom(T^*M \times ...^p... \times T^*M \times TM \times ...^q... \times TM, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)))$ is defined point-wise as

$$(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_p, X_1, ..., X_q) \mapsto \hat{T}({}^h\alpha_1, ..., {}^h\alpha_p, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_q) \in \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M),$$

that is linear in any of its arguments, for any $x\in M$ and $\alpha_i\in T^*_xM$, $X_i\in T_xM$ and with $\hat{T}\in T^{(p,q)}J^k_0(M)$. Similarly, any section $\bar{\omega}$ of $Hom(TM\times,...^p,\times,...,TM,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)$ is defined point-wise as

$$(X_1,...,X_p)\mapsto \hat{\omega}({}^hX_1,...,{}^hX_p)\in \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M),$$

for a unique such that it is alternate for any $x\in M$ and $X_i\in T_xM$ and with $\hat{\omega}\in\Lambda^p_hJ^k_0(M)$.

The homomorphism ϕ defined by (2.21) induces the injection (on the image of ϕ),

$$^k\zeta:=\phi^{-1}:\Gamma\,\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))\longrightarrow\Gamma\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M)). \tag{2.23}$$

In local coordinates (2.23) is such that

$$\begin{aligned}{}^k\zeta:\Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))&\longrightarrow\Gamma\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M))\\ \theta_I({}^kx)\,dx^I&\mapsto\theta_I({}^kx)\,\phi^{-1}(dx^I).\end{aligned}$$

where I is a multi-index. ${}^k\zeta$ is well defined, independent of coordinates and is an algebra homomorphism,

$${}^k\zeta(\alpha_1\wedge\alpha_2)={}^k\zeta(\alpha_1)\wedge{}^k\zeta(\alpha_2).$$

Also, note that ${}^k\zeta$ is an isomorphism on the image. Therefore, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}&{}^k\zeta^{-1}(\hat{\omega}_1\wedge\hat{\omega}_2)={}^k\zeta^{-1}(\hat{\omega}_1)\wedge{}^k\zeta^{-1}(\hat{\omega}_2),\\ &\hat{\omega}_1,\,\hat{\omega}_2\in\zeta(\Gamma\Lambda^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))))\subset\Gamma\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M)).\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.27 *Let ${}^k\mathcal{H}_1$ and ${}^k\mathcal{H}_2$ be two connections on $J^k_0(M)$.*

Proof. When one writes down ${}^k\zeta_1$ and ${}^k\zeta_2$ in local coordinate, it does not depend on the connection. □

Remark 2.28

1. The geometric framework for the generalized fields considered in this work will be smooth sections of $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ or sections of a given generalized tensor bundle $T^{(p,q)}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, for some specific natural number k. This will imply that when we apply the formalism to the electrodynamics, there are the same number of horizontal degrees of freedom that in the standard electromagnetic theory.

2. Note that those tensors can be understood as weak generalized tensor or strong generalized tensors, as was described before. In the case that one needs to speak about exterior derivatives, they will be tensors. The manifold M comes in the game because we can define such tensor along curves or along tubes that contain an specific $x\in M$.

We can consider the following generalized tensor algebra,

$$T^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))):=\sum_{p,q}\oplus T^{(p,q)}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))). \tag{2.24}$$

In a similar way, one defines the generalized exterior algebra,

$$\Lambda(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := \sum_{p=0}^{n} \oplus \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))), \tag{2.25}$$

with each $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ being $\mathcal{F}$-module. The homomorphism (2.21) implies that a local frame for $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ is obtained as the linear closure of a local frame $\{e_I(x),\, I = 1,...,dim(\Lambda^p(M))\}$ for $\Lambda^p(M)$ and with coefficients in $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0)$.

The product in the exterior algebra is defined as

$$\alpha({}^kx)\wedge\beta({}^kx) = (\alpha_I({}^kx)e^I(x))\wedge(\beta_J({}^kx)e^J(x)) := \alpha_I({}^kx)\,\beta_J({}^kx)\,e^I(x)\wedge e^J(x).$$

Given a p-form $\alpha\in\Lambda^pM$, there is a form $\varphi(\alpha)\in\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ such that for $(X_1, ..., X_p)\subset\Gamma TM$ is defined by $\varphi(\alpha)(X_1, ..., X_p) = \alpha(X_1,...,X_p)$. Therefore, one can establish the homomorphism of vector spaces

$$\varphi : \Lambda^pM \longrightarrow \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))), \quad \varphi(\alpha)_u(X_1,...,X_p) = \alpha_x(X_1,...,X_p). \tag{2.26}$$

The value $\varphi(\alpha)_u(X_1,...,X_p)$ is constant along the fiber $\forall u\in\pi^{-1}(x)$. We will prove in later *sections* that φ is an isomorphism of real vector bundles.

2.6 Generalized metric structures

The first relevant type of generalized tensor that we consider in some detail is the notion generalized metric $\bar{g}$. For the purposes of this paper it will be understood as a weak generalized higher order tensor. However, we star with the following

Definition 2.29 *A generalized metric $\hat{g}$ is a section $\hat{g}\in\Gamma\,T^{(0,2)}_h(J^k_0(M))$ understood as a week generalized tensor such that:*

1. *It is smooth: given a curve $x : I \longrightarrow M$ and a lift ${}^kx : I\to J^k_0(M)$, for any two smooth vector fields $\hat{X}_1$, $\hat{X}_2$ along ${}^kx : I\to J^k_0(M)$, the function $\hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_2) : I \longrightarrow R$ is smooth, except if $\hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_2) = 0$.*

2. *It is homogeneous of degree zero: if ${}^kx : I\to M$ has local coordinates $(x^\mu(s),\dot{x}^\mu(s),\ddot{x}^\mu(s)...)$, then*

$$\hat{g}(x^\mu(s),\lambda\dot{x}^\mu(s),\lambda\ddot{x}^\mu(s),...,\lambda\,(x^{(k)}(s)) = \lambda\hat{g}(x^\mu(s),\dot{x}^\mu(s),\ddot{x}^\mu(s),...\,(x^{(k)}(s)) \tag{2.27}$$

   for all $\lambda>0$.

3. *It is a symmetric form in the sense that $\hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_2) = \hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_2,\hat{X}_1)$ for any smooth pair of vector fields $\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_2$ along $x : I\to M$.*

4. *It is bilinear,*

$$\hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1 + f({}^kx)\hat{X}_2,\hat{X}_3) = \hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_3) + f({}^kx)\hat{g}({}^kx)(\hat{X}_1,\hat{X}_3), \tag{2.28}$$

   with $\hat{X}_1$, $\hat{X}_2$, X_3 vectors fields along the curve ${}^kx : I\to J^k_0(M)$ and $f\in\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$.

5. *It is weak non-degenerate in the following sense: if the condition*

$$\hat{g}({}^{k}x)(\hat{X}, \hat{Z}) = 0, \tag{2.29}$$

holds for any horizontal smooth vector field $\hat{Z}$ *along any curve* ${}^{k}x : I \to J^k_0(M)$*, then the horizontal field* $\hat{X} = 0$.

Given a generalized metric, there is defined a generalized a bilinear form g_u at the point $u \in {}^{k}\pi^{-1}(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_u :& T_xM \times T_xM \longrightarrow R \\ & (X_1, X_2) \mapsto g_u({}^{h}X_1, {}^{h}X_2) \end{aligned}$$

such that is positive homogeneous in the sense that $g_u(a\,y, a\,y) = a^2\, g(y, y)$ for any $a \in R^+$ and symmetric. Then following *proposition* 2.26, it is possible to interpret a generalized metric $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ as the bilinear form

$$g : TM \times TM \longrightarrow R \quad (X_1, X_2) \mapsto \hat{g}_u({}^{h}X_1, {}^{h}X_2). \tag{2.30}$$

Proposition 2.30 *The generalized metric* $\hat{g} \in \Gamma\, T^{(0,2)}_h J^k_0(M)$ *has associated a unique section* $\bar{g} \in \Gamma\, T^{(0,2)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ *such that*

1. $\bar{g}$ *is smooth in the sense that for all* X_1, X_2 *smooth vector fields along the curve* $x : I \to M$*, the function* $\bar{g}(X_1, X_2)$ *is smooth except when it is zero.*

2. *It is homogeneous of degree zero: if* ${}^{k}x : I \to M$ *has local coordinates* $(x^\mu(s), \dot{x}^\mu(s), \ddot{x}^\mu(s) ...)$*, then*

$$g(x^\mu(s), \lambda\dot{x}^\mu(s), \lambda\ddot{x}^\mu(s), ..., \lambda(x^{(k)}(s)) = g(x^\mu(s), dotx^\mu(s), \ddot{x}^\mu(s), ..., (x^{(k)}(s)) \tag{2.31}$$

   for all $\lambda > 0$.

3. $\bar{g}$ *is symmetric, in the sense that*

$$\bar{g}(X_1, X_2) = \bar{g}(X_2, X_1)$$

   for all $X_1, , X_2$ *smooth vector fields along the curve*$x : \longrightarrow M$.

4. *It is bilinear,*

$$\bar{g}(X_1 + f({}^{k}x)X_2, X_3) = \bar{g}(X_1, X_3) + f({}^{k}x)\bar{g}(X_2, X_3),$$

   for all X_1, X_2, X_3 *arbitrary smooth vector fields along* $x : I \to M$ *and* $f \in \mathcal{F}(M)$.

5. *It is non-degenerate, in the sense that if* $\bar{g}(X, Z) = 0$ *for all* Z *smooth along* $x : I \to M$*, then* $X = 0$.

Proof. By *proposition* 2.26, it is enough to show the above properties one by one from the definition 2.29. For instance, we check the non-degeneracy condition. The other properties follow using similar calculations. If $\hat{g}$ is non-degenerate, then $g(X,Z) = \hat{g}(h(X),h(Z)) = 0$ for all $Z \in \Gamma TM$ implies that, since $h : T_xM \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}J^k_0(x)$ is an isomorphism of real vector spaces, $X(x) = 0$ at any $x \in M$. $\square$

Example 2.31 1. A relevant example that will appear in later *sections* is a generalized metric of the form

$$g(\,^kx) = \lambda(\,^kx)\,\eta(x), \tag{2.32}$$

with λ a positive, homogeneous of degree zero element of $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$ for some fixed positive integer k and η the Minkowski metric, with $^kx : I \to J^k_0(M)$ the lift of the curve $x : I \to M$.

2. Generalized metrics are provided by Finsler structures [2]. In this case the vertical hessian $g_{ij}(u)$ of the Finsler function F is smooth on $TM \setminus \{0\}$. This example is of positive signature.

A particular interesting case corresponds to generalized metrics of the form (2.32),

$$g(u) = \lambda(u)\,\eta(x),\;\; x = \,^k\pi(u)\, \subset J^k_0(M).$$

where η is a Lorentzian metric on M. The exact form of the conformal factor λ will be elucidated later in the context of geometries of maximal covariant acceleration. Therefore, the bilinear form g is not a (pseudo)-Riemannian metric, since λ is not a function on M but a function on $J^2_0(M)$. In particular, we assume that $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M))$ is invariant under local transformations of coordinates on M [4].

Given a curve $x : I \to M$ and a vector field W along the curve, when the signature of g is $(-1, 1, ..., 1)$ one can define a bilinear, positive definite, symmetric form $\hat{g} \in \Gamma T^{(0,2)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ such that along the curve

$$g_+(X,X)(u) = \, g(X,X)(u) \; - 2\,\frac{g^2(X,W)}{g(W,W)}(u), \quad g(W,W) > 0, \tag{2.33}$$

with $u = \,^kx(s) \in J^k_0(M), \quad X \in \Gamma TM$. For a generalized metric of the form $g = \lambda\eta$, the bilinear, positive form 2.33 is

$$g_+(X,X)(u) = \lambda(u)\,\eta_+(X,X)(x), \quad g(W,W) > 0, \quad u \in J^k_0(M), \quad X \in \Gamma TM,$$

with

$$\eta_+(X,X)(x) = \, \eta(X,X)(x) \; - 2\frac{\eta^2(X,W)}{\eta(W,W)}(x).$$

Both generalized Riemannian metrics η_+ and g_+ can be used to provide a definition of length along the curve $x : I \to M$.

---

[4] In order to simplify the treatment and the calculations, we are considering flat space-time in the sense that η is flat. Therefore, η is Minkowski and M is a flat domain of $\mathbf{R}^n$ of dimension n. In physical applications the action of the Lorentz group as transformation group is the standard one. For $n = 4$, the factor λ will be proved that is Lorentz invariant.

2.7 Isometries of generalized metrics

Let $\psi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ be a diffeomorphism and denote the tangent map by $\psi_* : TJ^k_0(M) \longrightarrow TJ^k_0(M)$. Then one can define the following homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_x : T_xM &\longrightarrow T_{{}^k\pi(\psi(u))}(M) \\ X &\mapsto {}^k\pi_* \circ (\psi_*)|_u \circ {}^hX, \end{aligned}$$

with ${}^k\pi(u) = x$.

Definition 2.32 *An isometry of a generalized metric $\hat{g}$ is a diffeomorphism $\psi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ such that on any arbitrary curve $x : I \to M$*

$$\hat{g}_{{}^kx}(X_1, X_2) = \hat{g}_{\psi({}^kx)}(\hat{\psi}_x(X_1), \hat{\psi}_x(X_2)), \tag{2.34}$$

for any two vector fields along $x : I \to M$.

One can define similarly local isometries.

It is clear that the set of isometries $Iso(\hat{g})$ of the generalized metric $\hat{g}$ is a subgroup of the group of diffeomorphism $Diff(J^k_0(M))$.

Example 2.33 Isometry groups of some generalized metrics

1. Isometries of the metric of type $\hat{g}({}^kx) = \lambda({}^kx)\eta(x)$. Let $Iso(\hat{g})$ be the group of isometries of g, and let $iso(\lambda)$ the group of diffeomorphisms such that

   $$iso(\lambda) := \Big\{\psi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow J^k_0(M),\ s.t\ \lambda \circ \psi = \lambda\Big\}.$$

   The isometry group of η is $Iso(\eta)$. Then one can write

   $$Iso(\hat{g}) = Iso(\eta) \cap iso(\lambda) \times \mathcal{D}$$

   with $\mathcal{D}$ is the multiplicative group of dilatations. From such distinction is obvious that $iso(\lambda) \subset Iso(\eta)$ and that it is a subgroup of $Iso(\eta)$. However, given $\lambda({}^kx) = a$ fixed, the transformations such that $\lambda \circ \psi = a$ form a close subgroup of all diffeomorphism $Iso(\eta)$. Therefore, $Iso(\eta)$ is closed and Lie group. In particular, we are interested in the case when λ is invariant under $Iso(\eta)$. In that case, one has that $Iso(\eta) \cap iso(\lambda) = Iso(\eta)$. On the other hand, the elements $\mathcal{D}$ are such that $\lambda({}^kx) \mapsto f({}^kx)\lambda({}^k)$ and $\eta(x) \mapsto \eta' = f^{-1}({}^kx)\eta(x)$. If η' must live on M, then f is a dilation.

2. Isometries of a Finsler metric. In this case, the group of isometries is a Lie group [18]. In particular, the group of transformations that preserve the Finsler function F (see [2] for standard notation in Finsler geometry) coincides with the group of transformations that leave the *Finslerian distance* invariant. They also prove that the group of isometries is a differentiable manifold and a Lie group.

It could be very interesting to know when the group of isometries of a generalized metric is a Lie group.

2.8 Generalized g-dual isomorphism

Let us consider the pull-back bundle

$$\begin{tikzcd}
{}^k\pi^*TM \arrow[r, "\rho_2"] \arrow[d, "\rho_1"'] & TM \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
J^k_0(M) \arrow[r, "{}^k\pi"] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then a generalized metric $g(u)$ (without "hat" from now on) can be understood as a flat metric along the fiber $\rho_1^{-1}(u) \subset {}^k\pi^*TM$. This fiber metric is determined by its action on the pull-back of the local frame on M

$$\{{}^k\pi^*_u(\tilde{e}_1(x)), ..., {}^k\pi^*_u(\tilde{e}_n(x)), \quad \tilde{e}_i(x) \in \Gamma T_U M\},$$

and in such frame, the fiber metric has components

$$g(u)_{ij} := g|_u({}^k\pi^*_u(\tilde{e}_i(x)), {}^k\pi^*_u(\tilde{e}_j(x))).$$

In a similar way as in the pseudo-Riemannian case, one can diagonalize the metric component matrix $g_{ij}(u = {}^kx(s))$ along $x : I \to M$ using Gram-Schmidt procedure at each point. The difference with the Gram-Schmidt for pseudo-Riemannian manifolds is that the matrix of the transformation lives on $J^k_0(M)$. In such orthonormal frame

$$\big(g_u({}^k\pi^*e_i(u), \pi^*e_j(u))\big) = diag\big(-1, ..., -1, 1, ..., 1\big)$$

in $\rho_1^{-1}(u = {}^kx(s)) \subset {}^k\pi^*TM$ holds. Therefore, the projection ρ_2 provides a local frame $\{\rho_2({}^k\pi^*e_1(u)), ..., \rho_2({}^k\pi^*e_n(u))\}$ along the curve $x : I \to M$ such that the generalized metric $g(x(s))$ is diagonal,

$$g_u(e_i, e_j) := g(u)_{ij} = \delta_{ij}. \tag{2.35}$$

The inverse of the matrix $g(u)_{ij}$ has components $g(u)^{ij}$ and determines an element of $\Gamma T^{(2,0)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ which is non-degenerate and symmetric. The raising and lowering indices operations are defined using g^{-1} and g (if anything else is specified). g^{-1} denotes the inverse matrix components of g, so fixed a frame on M, one obtains $g^{-1} = \big(g^{-1}\big)^{ij} e_i \otimes e_j$ such that $\big(g^{-1}\big)^{il} g_{lj} = \delta^i_j$.

The generalized metric g determines the isomorphism,

$$g : \Gamma T^{(1,0)}(M, \mathcal{F}(M, J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma T^{(0,1)}(M, \mathcal{F}(M, J^k_0(M))), \quad X \mapsto \tilde{X} := g(X, \cdot). \tag{2.36}$$

In similar way, the generalized tensor g^{-1} determines the following canonical isomorphism,

$$g^{-1} : \Gamma\Lambda^1(M, \mathcal{F}(M, J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma T^{(1,0)}(M, \mathcal{F}(M, J^k_0(M))), \quad \omega \mapsto g^{-1}(\omega, \cdot). \tag{2.37}$$

and a lowering index operation

$$\kappa : \Gamma\Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma T^{(1,1)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))), \quad \kappa(\alpha)(\omega, X) := \alpha(g^{-1}(\omega, \cdot), X), \tag{2.38}$$

with $\quad X \in \Gamma TM$, $\alpha \in \Gamma\Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, $\omega \in \Gamma\Lambda^1(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$.

2.9 A generalized star operator

We will follow the treatment for instance in [26]. The generalized metric g determines a Hodge operator $\star_g$ on the algebra

$$\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := \sum_{p=0}^{n} \oplus \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \tag{2.39}$$

in the following way. Let $\{e^i(u),\, i=1,...,n\}$ be a local, orthonormal frame respect of g defined as before. The Levi-Civita symbol is denoted by $\epsilon_{j_1 \dots j_n}$. Then the $\star_g$ operator on $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ is the $\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))$-multilineal map determined by the image on the elements $e^{i_1}\wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_p}$,

$$\star_g : \Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{n-p}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$$

$$(e^{i_1}({}^k x)\wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_p}({}^k x)) \mapsto \epsilon_{j_1 \dots j_n}\, g^{i_1 j_1}\, \cdots g^{i_p j_p} e^{j_{p+1}}({}^k x)\wedge \cdots \wedge e^{j_n}({}^k x) \tag{2.40}$$

and then it is extended to an arbitrary generalized form

$$\alpha = \alpha_{i_1 \dots . i_p}({}^k x)\, e^{i_1}({}^k x)\wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_p}({}^k x)\ \in \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$$

by the multilineal property [26],

$$\star\,\alpha({}^k x) =\ \alpha_{i_1 \dots . i_p}({}^k x)\epsilon_{j_1 \dots j_n}\, g^{i_1 j_1}\, \cdots g^{i_p j_p} e^{j_{p+1}}({}^k x)\wedge \cdots \wedge e^{j_n}({}^k x).$$

By direct computation in a orthogonal frame, one easily proves the following generalization of the Hodge star operator,

Proposition 2.34

$$\star\,\star\,\alpha\ = (-1)^{p(n-1)+s(g)}\alpha, \quad \alpha \in\ \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))), \tag{2.41}$$

where $s(g)$ is the signature of the generalized metric g.

If M is 4-dimensional, the $\star_g$ operator on 2-forms is invariant under conformal transformations of g. Therefore, when acting on an ordinary differential 2-form on M, the operators $\star_g$ and $\star_\eta$ operators determined by $g = \lambda\,\eta$ and η respectively coincide.

2.10 Length and proper time associated to generalized metrics

When the generalized tensor g is positive definite, a distance function on M is defined in the following way. Let $x : [\sigma_1, \sigma_2] \to M$ be a smooth curve. Then the length $x(\sigma)$ is

$$L[x] = \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} \sqrt{g|_{(x,\frac{dx}{d\sigma},\frac{d^2x}{d\sigma^2},...)}(\frac{dx(\sigma)}{d\sigma},\frac{dx(\sigma)}{d\sigma})}\, d\sigma. \tag{2.42}$$

Definition 2.35 *Let M be a connected manifold. The distance function between two points p, $q \in M$ is defined to be*

$$d(p,q) = \inf \big\{ L[x],\, x(\sigma_1) = p,\, x(\sigma_2) = q \big\}. \tag{2.43}$$

Given a point p and a submanifold $N \hookrightarrow M$, the distance between p and N is

$$d(p,N) := \inf \big\{ d(p,q),\, q \in N \big\}. \tag{2.44}$$

The notions of boundness, metric balls, completeness etc... can be extended from Riemannian metric geometry to this generalized setting.

If g is of non-definite signature, the standard notions of causal curves can be transplanted in complete analogy from Lorentzian geometry [4]. For instance, there is a well defined notions for causal curves:

1. A vector field $X \in \Gamma TM$ is timelike if $g(X,X) < 0$. A curve $x : I \to M$ is time-like if the tangent vector field is timelike.
2. A vector field is lightlike if $g(X,X) = 0$; a curve on M is lightlike if the tangent vector field is lightlike.
3. A vector field $X \in \Gamma TM$ is space-like if $g(X,X) > 0$. A curve on M is space-like if the tangent vector field is space-like.

The proper-time of a non space-like curve is

$$L[x] =: \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} \sqrt{-g|\,{}_{k}{}_{x(s)}(\frac{dx}{d\sigma}, \frac{dx}{d\sigma})}\, d\sigma. \tag{2.45}$$

The Lorentzian distance between two causal connected points (that be connected by a non space-like curve) is

$$d(p,q) = \sup \big\{ L[x],\, x(\sigma_1) = p,\, x(\sigma_2) = q \big\}. \tag{2.46}$$

The proper-time parameter along a non space-like curve $x : [\sigma_1, \sigma_2] \to M$ is the function

$$\tau[x] =: \int_{\sigma_1}^{\xi} \sqrt{-g|\,{}_{k}{}_{x(\sigma)}(\frac{dx}{d\sigma}, \frac{dx}{d\sigma})}\, d\sigma. \tag{2.47}$$

The notion of length of a curve in the positive case and of proper time in the Lorentzian case have geometric meaning,

Proposition 2.36 *Given a generalized metric structure (M,g), the The Weirestrass functional acting on an arbitrary curve $x : [\sigma_1, \sigma_2] \to M$,*

$$W[x] =: \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma} \sqrt{\big|g|\,{}_{k}{}_{x(\sigma)}(\frac{dx}{d\sigma}, \frac{dx}{d\sigma})\big|}\, d\sigma, \tag{2.48}$$

is independent of the parametrization.

Proof. It is a consequence of the homogeneity condition of g. □

As in the standard Morse theory, the investigation of the critical points of the functional (2.48) can be performed by standard techniques of analysis and can bring important information on the local and global properties of geometric spaces.

Given a non spacelike curve $x : I \to M$, the proper time (or arc-length function $s(x(\sigma)$ in the positive case) $\tau[x(\sigma)]$ depends only on the point $x(\sigma)$ and the initial point $x(\sigma_1)$. Therefore, one can use $\tau(\sigma)$ as a parameter of the curve.

Example 2.37

1. Let us consider the generalized metric $g({}^kx) = \lambda({}^kx)\,\eta(x)$, with η a Lorentzian metric. Then if λ is re-parametrization invariant, g is re-parametrization invariant too and the proper-time (or arc-length) is also re-parametrization invariant.

2. The fundamental tensor of a Finsler spacetime structure [3] is homogeneous of degree zero. Therefore, the fundamental tensor in a Finsler spacetime

   $$g_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 L(x,y)}{\partial y^i \partial y^j} \tag{2.49}$$

   is homogeneous of degree zero. When one evaluates the tensor g on each curve $x : I \to M$ one has defines a generalized metric $g(x,\dot{x})$. The the proper time parameter is reparameterization invariant.

Let g be of Lorentz signature $(-1,1,1,1)$. For generalized metrics of the type $g = \lambda\,\eta$, with (M,η) a geodesic complete space-time and λ bounded on M, the causal theory of η and g are related. For instance, it is not difficult to see that the notions of global hyperbolicity for (M,g) and (M,η) coincide. A notion of time orientable is natural in this case.

2.11 Cartan calculus for generalized forms

In this subsection we generalize the fundamental notions of Cartan calculus for generalized differential forms viewed as sections of $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$.

The inner derivative of the exterior algebra ΛM,

$$\iota_X : \Gamma\Lambda^p M \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p-1}M, \quad \Lambda^p M \ni \alpha \mapsto \iota_X\alpha \in \Lambda^{p-1}M,$$

with $X \in \Gamma TM$ and defined as

$$(\iota_X\alpha)(X_1,...,X_{p-1}) = \alpha(X,X_1,...,X_{p-1})$$

can be extended to generalized forms,

Definition 2.38 *Given the algebra of generalized differential forms $\Lambda\,\Gamma(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ and $X \in \Gamma TM$. Then the inner derivative is*

$$\iota_X : \Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p-1}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))), \quad \bar{\alpha} \mapsto {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar{\alpha}. \tag{2.50}$$

Proposition 2.39 *The basic properties of the interior product also hold:*

1. *It is linear,*

$$\iota_X(\bar\alpha_1 + f(x)\bar\alpha_2) = \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_1 + f(x)\,\iota_X\, f(x)\,\bar\alpha_2, \quad \bar\alpha_i \in \Gamma\,\Lambda^{p_i} J^k_0(M),\ f \in \mathcal{F}(M),$$

2. *For every* $X \in \Gamma TM$, $\iota_X \circ \iota_X\,\bar\alpha = 0$, $\forall \bar\alpha \in \Gamma\,\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$.
3. *It is an skew-derivation; for any* $\bar\alpha_i \in \Gamma\Lambda^{p_i}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, $i = 1, 2$,

$$\iota_X\,(\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \bar\alpha_2) = \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \bar\alpha_2 + (-1)^{p_1}\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_2.$$

4. *It is zero when acting on sections of* $\Gamma\,\Lambda^0(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$.

Proof. For the linearity the prove is a direct computation,

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_X(\bar\alpha_1 + f(x)\,\bar\alpha_2) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\big(\bar\alpha_1 + f(x)\bar\alpha_2\big)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\big({}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_1 + {}^k\zeta\, f(x)\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_2\big)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\big(\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_1 + {}^k\zeta\, f(x)\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_2\big)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_1 + {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,{}^k\zeta\, f(x)\,{}^k\zeta^{-1}\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_2\\ &= \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_1 + f(x)\,\iota_X\, f(x)\,\bar\alpha_2.\end{aligned}$$

For the second property,

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_X\,\iota_X\,\bar\alpha &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,{}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

For the third property, if $\bar\alpha \in \Lambda^{p_1}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$,

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_X(\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \bar\alpha_2) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,(\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \bar\alpha_2)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\iota_{{}^hX}\big({}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge {}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_2\big)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\Big(\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge {}^k\zeta\bar\alpha_2 + (-1)^{p_1}\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha_2\Big)\\ &= \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \bar\alpha_2 + (-1)^{p_1}\,\bar\alpha_1 \wedge \iota_X\,\bar\alpha_2.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the proof of the last property is a direct calculation: if $\bar\alpha \in \Lambda^0(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$,

$$\iota_X\,\bar\alpha = {}^k\zeta^{-1}(\iota_{{}^hX}\,{}^k\zeta\bar\alpha) = {}^k\zeta^{-1}(0) = 0.$$

□

Proposition 2.40 *The definition of the inner derivatives (2.38) is equivariant.*

Proof. Given two horizontal distributions ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$ and ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ as in *theorem* 2.8, there are two definitions of inner derivatives of generalized forms,

$${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1 \Rightarrow {}^1\iota_X\,\bar\alpha = {}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\iota_{{}^{h_1}X}\,{}^k\zeta_1\,\bar\alpha, \quad {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2 \Rightarrow {}^2\iota_X\,\bar\alpha = {}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\iota_{{}^{h_2}X}\,{}^k\zeta_2\,\bar\alpha.$$

Comparing the two inner derivatives,

$$\begin{aligned} {}^1\iota_X\,\bar\alpha - {}^2\iota_X\,\bar\alpha &= {}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\iota_{\,{}^{h_1}X}\,{}^k\zeta_1\,\bar\alpha - {}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\iota_{\,{}^{h_2}X}\,{}^k\zeta_2\,\bar\alpha \\ &= {}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\Big(\iota_{\,{}^{h_1}X}\,{}^k\zeta_1\,\bar\alpha - {}^k\zeta_1\,{}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\iota_{\,{}^{h_2}X}\,{}^k\zeta_2\,\bar\alpha\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Using local coordinates, one can see that ${}^k\zeta_1\,{}^k\zeta_2^{-1} = Id$. Therefore,

$${}^1\iota_X\,\bar\alpha - {}^2\iota_X\,\bar\alpha = {}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\Big(\iota_{\,{}^{h_1}X}\,{}^k\zeta_1\,\bar\alpha\Big) - \iota_{\,{}^{h_2}X}\,{}^k\zeta_2\,\bar\alpha\Big)$$

On the other hand, ${}^{h_1}X - {}^{h_2}X = \mathbf{V}$ is vertical (the easiest way to check this is using local coordinates). Then one gets

$$\hat\alpha_2({}^{h_2}X,\cdot) - \hat\alpha_1({}^{h_1}X,\cdot) = \hat\alpha_1({}^{h_1}X,\cdot) - \hat\alpha_2({}^{h_1}X,\cdot).$$

By the equivariance of ζ, one has that $\hat\alpha_1({}^{h_1}X,\cdot) = \hat\alpha_2({}^{h_1}X,\cdot)$, that proves the result. □

The generalization of the exterior differential operator d on smooth forms over M

$$d : \Gamma\Lambda^p M \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p+1}M$$

to sections of $\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ can be introduced in the following way. We are looking for a $\mathcal{F}(M)$ anti-derivation of the algebra $\Lambda(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ of degree 1,

$$d_4 : \Gamma\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p+1}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$$

Let us consider the exterior derivative on the jet bundle $J^k_0(M)$

$$d_J : \Gamma\Lambda^p(J^k_0(M)) \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p+1}_h(J^k_0(M)). \tag{2.51}$$

Let us consider the horizontal component

$$\hat h_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta\,\alpha\big).$$

Definition 2.41 *We define the following homomorphism*

$$d_4 : \Gamma\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^{p+1}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \quad \bar\alpha \mapsto {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\hat h_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha\big). \tag{2.52}$$

In order to prove some basic properties of d_4 we will need the following

Lemma 2.42 *The isomorphism 2.23 implies the relations*

1. *For any $p+1$ vector fields $X_1, ..., X_{p+1}$ vector fields on M, it holds that*

$${}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\hat h_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta\,\bar\alpha\big)(X_1, ..., X_{p+1}) = \hat h_k\big(d_J\,\hat\alpha\big)({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \tag{2.53}$$

2. *For any form $\hat\alpha \in \Lambda^p(J^k_0(M))$ and $p+1$ vector fields $X_1, ..., X_{p+1}$ vector fields on M,*

$$d_J\hat h_k\hat\alpha({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) = \hat h_k d_J\hat\alpha({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \tag{2.54}$$

Proof. The first property is direct from the definition of the homomorphism ζ. The second property requires Cartan's formula for the exterior differential $d_J\hat{\alpha}$,

$$d_J\hat{\alpha}({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,{}^hX_i(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}))$$

$$+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\hat{\alpha}\,([{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \tag{2.55}$$

Note that $\hat{h}_k$ is linear. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_J\big(\hat{h}_k(\hat{\alpha})\big)({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,{}^hX_i(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})) \\ &+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha}\,([{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ... {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $[{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j] - {}^h[X_i, X_j]$ is a vertical vector field. Therefore,

$$\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha}\,([{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j] - {}^h[X_i, X_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ... {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) = 0$$

and since ${}^hX_i$ are horizontal,

$$\begin{aligned} d_J\big(\hat{h}_k(\hat{\alpha})\big)({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,{}^hX_i\big((\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})\big)\big) \\ &+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha}\,(\,[{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ... {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,{}^hX_i(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_p))\big) \\ &+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha}\,({}^h[X_i, X_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ... {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since

$$d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_p))({}^hX_i) = ({}^hX_i)\cdot(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})),$$

Cartan's formula can be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned} d_J\hat{\alpha}({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) \;&=\; \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}))({}^hX_i) \\ &+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\hat{\alpha}\,({}^h[\,X_i, X_j], {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we compute the right hand side of (2.54). Since $\hat{h}_k$ is linear, one has that

$$\hat{h}_k\, d_J\hat{\alpha}({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,\hat{h}_k(d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})))({}^hX_i)$$
$$+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})\,([{}^hX_i,{}^h X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}).$$

Each of the first terms can be compute as

$$\hat{h}_k d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}))({}^hX_i) = d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_p))({}^hX_i).$$

As before we use that $[{}^hX_i,\, {}^hX_j] - {}^h[X_i, X_j]$ is vertical. Therefore,

$$\hat{h}_k\Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})\,([{}^hX_i,{}^h X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})\Big)$$
$$= \sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})({}^h[X_i, X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})$$
$$= \sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{\alpha})({}^h[X_i, X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}).$$

Gluing all together,

$$\hat{h}_k d_J\hat{\alpha}({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}) = \;\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,\hat{h}_k d_J(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}))({}^hX_i)$$
$$\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})({}^h[X_i, X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}).$$

This fact proves the second property. □.

From the prove of *lemma* 2.42, one obtains an explicit formula for the exterior differential $d_4\bar{\alpha} \in \Lambda^{p+1}(M, J^k_0(M))$ acting on $p+1$ vector fields $X_1, ..., X_{p+1}$ on M,

$$d_4\bar{\alpha}(X_1, ..., X_{p+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,{}^hX_i(\hat{\alpha}\,({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}))$$
$$+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}(\hat{h}_k\hat{\alpha})({}^h[X_i, X_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}).$$

The operator d_4 is related with the exterior covariant derivative $D_{{}^k\mathcal{H}}$ [32].

$$(D_{{}^k\mathcal{H}}\omega)(X_1, ..., X_{p+1}) := \;(d_J\omega)({}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+1}\,\hat{\omega}\,({}^hX_i)\cdot({}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1})$$
$$+\sum_{i,j=1}^{p+1}(-1)^{i+j+1}\beta)\,([{}^hX_i,\, {}^hX_j],\, {}^hX_1, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_i}, ..., {}^h\widehat{X_j}, ..., {}^hX_{p+1}),$$
$$\omega \in\, \Gamma\,\Lambda^p(J^k_0(M)).$$

Indeed, on has the following,

Proposition 2.43 *Given* $\hat{alpha} \in \Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(M, J_0^k(M))$*, then it holds that*

$$d_4\bar{\alpha} = D_{{}^k\mathcal{H}}\hat{\alpha}. \tag{2.56}$$

The exterior covariant derivative is not nilpoten in general. However, since the form ${}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha} \in \Lambda_h^p(J_0^k(M))$ is horizontal, and the curvature vector field

$$R(X_i, X_j) := [{}^hX_i, {}^hX_j] - {}^h[X_i, X_j] \tag{2.57}$$

is vertical, one has that when applied to $\hat{\alpha}$, $D_{{}^k\mathcal{H}} \circ D_{{}^k\mathcal{H}}\hat{\alpha} = 0$. This result and others are formalize again in the following

Proposition 2.44 *The exterior differential operator 2.52 has the following properties:*

1. *It is linear,*
$$d_4(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \lambda\,\bar{\alpha}_2) = d_4(\bar{\alpha}_1) + \lambda\, d_4\bar{\alpha}_2, \quad \bar{\alpha}_i \in \Gamma\,\Lambda^{p_i}J_0^k(M),\, \lambda \in R,$$
2. *It is an skew-derivation; for any* $\bar{\alpha}_i \in \Gamma\Lambda^{p_i}(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)))$, $i = 1, 2$,
$$d_4\,(\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge \bar{\alpha}_2) = d_4\,\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge \bar{\alpha}_2 + (-1)^p\,\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge d_4\,\bar{\alpha}_2.$$
3. *Acting on an arbitrary function* $f \in \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)) = \Gamma\Lambda^0(M\mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)))$ *is expressed in local coordinates as*
$$d_4(f) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu}\, d_4x^\mu, \;\; f \in \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)).$$
4. *It is* 2*-steps nilpotent,*
$$d_4\, d_4\, \bar{\alpha} = 0, \quad \forall\bar{\alpha} \in \Gamma\,\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))) \tag{2.58}$$

Proof. The first property is an easier calculation, completely analogous to the proof of the linearity of the interior product, except that λ is a scalar.

The second property follows from the following calculation. If $\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\alpha}_2 \in \Gamma\Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M)))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d_4(\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge \bar{\alpha}_2) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}d_J({}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge \bar{\alpha}_2) \\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\hat{h}_k\big(d_J({}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_1) \wedge {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_2)\big) \\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\Big(\hat{h}_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_1)\big) \wedge {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_2) + (-1)^p\,\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge \hat{h}_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha}_2)\big)\Big) \\ &= d_4(\bar{\alpha}_1) \wedge \bar{\alpha}_2 + (-1)^p\,\bar{\alpha}_1 \wedge d_4(\bar{\alpha}_2). \end{aligned}$$

The third property is proved using local coordinates. If (U, x) is a local coordinate system on M, we have that

$$d_4f({}^kx) = {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\hat{h}_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta(f({}^kx))\big).$$

In local coordinates this relation is

$$\begin{aligned} d_4 f({}^k x) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\hat{h}_k\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu}\,{}^k\zeta(dx^\mu) + \frac{\partial f({}^k x)}{dy^A}\,\delta y^A\Big)\\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu}\,{}^k\zeta(dx^\mu) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu}\,{}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\hat{h}_k\big({}^k\zeta(dx^\mu)\big)\\ &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu} d_4 x^\mu . \end{aligned}$$

After a short calculation, using *lemma* 2.42 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} d_4\, d_4\bar{\alpha}({}^h X_1, ..., {}^h X_{p+2})(X_1, ..., X_{p+2}) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\,\hat{h}_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\hat{h}_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\big)\big)(\,X_1, ..., X_{p+2})\\ &= \hat{h}_k d_J\,\big(\big(\,d_J\,{}^k\hat{\alpha}\big)\big)\big)({}^h X_1, ..., {}^h X_{p+2})\\ &= \hat{h}_k\hat{h}_k\ d_J\ d_J\,(\hat{\alpha})({}^h X_1, ..., {}^h X_{p+2}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next propositions shows the interesting property that d_4 does not depend on the connection,

Proposition 2.45 *The exterior differential operator (2.52) is equivariant.*

Proof. Given to connections ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_i, \quad i = 1, 2$, one has two anti-derivations

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha} &\mapsto {}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_1(\bar{\alpha})\big)\\ \bar{\alpha} &\mapsto {}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_2(\bar{\alpha})\big). \end{aligned}$$

We compare both anti-derivations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &{}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_1(\bar{\alpha})\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1}) - {}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_2(\bar{\alpha})\big)({}^{h_2}X_1, ..., {}^{h_2}X_{p+1})\\ &{}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_1(\bar{\alpha}_{)}\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1})\\ &-\ {}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_2(\bar{\alpha})\big)({}^{h_1}X_1 + V_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1} + V_{p+2}), \end{aligned}$$

for some vertical vector fields V_i such that ${}^{h_2}X_i = {}^{h_1}X_i + V_i$, $i = 1, ..., p+1$. Then the first and second pieces above are, by *proposition* 2.26,

$${}^k\zeta_1^{-1}\hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_1(\bar{\alpha})\big)({}^{h_1}X_1 + V_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+2} + V_{p+1}) = \hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1});$$

$${}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_2(\bar{\alpha})\big)({}^{h_1}X_1 + V_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+2} + V_{p+1}) = \hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1}).$$

Note the relation

$$\hat{\alpha}_2 := \hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}_2\big) = \hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}_2\big) + \mathbf{V} := \hat{\alpha}_1 + \mathbf{V}, \tag{2.59}$$

with $\mathbf{V}$ a vertical $p+1$-form. Since it is vertical and we need to take contractions with horizontal vectors,

$$\mathbf{V}({}^{h_1}X_1 + V_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+2} + V_{p+1}) = 0$$

and then

$${}^k\zeta_2^{-1}\hat{h}^2_k\big(d_J\,{}^k\zeta_{(}\bar{\alpha}_2)\big)({}^{h_1}X_1 + V_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+2} + V_{p+1}) = \hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}_2\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1}).$$

Again, note that $\hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2$ is vertical,

$$\hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}_2\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1}) = \hat{h}^1_k\big(d_J\,\hat{\alpha}\big)({}^{h_1}X_1, ..., {}^{h_1}X_{p+1})$$

from where the result follows. □

Example 2.46 A 1-form $\phi \in \Gamma\Lambda^1(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0 M))$ can be written in local coordinates as

$$\phi = \phi_i(x(s),\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\, d_4 x^i.$$

Then its exterior derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} d_4\phi &= d_4\big(\phi_i(x(s),\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\big) \\ &= d\big(\phi_i(x(s),\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\big) \\ &= \partial_j\, \phi_i(x(s),\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\, d_4 x^j\, \wedge d_4 x^i. \end{aligned}$$

From this example, it is clear that $d_4\phi$ does not depend on the coordinate system. If we calculate d_4^2 one obtains the expression

$$d_4(d_4\phi) = \partial_j \partial_l\, \phi_i(x(s),\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\, d_4 x^l \wedge\, d_4 x^j\, \wedge d_4 x^i = 0.$$

It is natural to ask wether there is a generalization of Cartan's formula:

Proposition 2.47 *The following formula holds:*

$$(\iota_X\, \circ d_4\, + d_4\, \circ \iota_X)(\bar{\alpha}) = {}^k\zeta^k\, \hat{h}_k\Big(\mathcal{L}_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big). \tag{2.60}$$

for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \Gamma\, \Lambda^p(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, $X \in \Gamma\, TM$.

Proof. The prove is a calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} (\iota_X\, \circ d_4\, + d_4\, \circ \iota_X)(\bar{\alpha}) &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\iota_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta\, {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(d_J\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) + {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(d_J\, {}^k\zeta\, {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \iota_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) \\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\iota_{{}^hX}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(d_J\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) + {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(d_J\, \iota_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) \\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\hat{h}_k\Big(\iota_{{}^hX}\, d_J\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) + {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(d_J\, \iota_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big) \\ &= {}^k\zeta^{-1}\, \hat{h}_k\Big(\mathcal{L}_{{}^hX}\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{\alpha})\Big). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.48 It is natural to ask wether the above formula reduces the known case when we take $k = 0$ and therefore $J^0_0(M) \simeq M$. In this case, ${}^hX = X$ and $\hat{H}_0 = Id$. Therefore, it is clear that equation (2.60) coincides with the usual Cartan formula.

It is clear that other standard relations of the Cartan calculus can be extended to the algebra of generalized forms.

2.12 Vertical volume forms

Let us consider a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on $J^k_0(M)$. We construct a vertical nk-form

$$dvol_V({}^kx) \in \Gamma\, \Lambda^{nk} J^k_0(M)$$

different than zero at each point of a local trivialization of ${}^k\pi^{-1}(U)$, with $U \subset M$ being an open subset on M. Given a system of local coordinates $(x^\mu,\, y^A,\, \mu = 1,...,k,\, A = 1,...,kn)$ on a local trivialization $U \times R^{nk}$ of $J^k_0(M)$, a vertical volume form can be constructed using a non-linear connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the corresponding covariant vertical frame $\{\delta y^A,\, A = 1,...,nk\}$ (2.15) allows to define the local form

$$dvol_V({}^kx) := w({}^kx)\,\delta y^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \delta y^{nk}. \tag{2.61}$$

on the trivialization $U \times R^{nk}$.

Proposition 2.49 *The volume form $dvol_V$ has the following properties:*

1. *$dvol_V$ is a vertical form, $dvol_V(...,X,...) = 0$ for any X horizontal.*
2. *It is natural and globally defined on $J^k_0(M)$,*

Proof. The first statement follows from the fact that it is constructed with vertical forms and the notion of being vertical is equivariant. The second property is immediate using the connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on the fiber bundle ${}^k\pi : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow M$. □

Definition 2.50 *Given a connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, a vertical volume form is a section of $\Lambda^{nk}J^k_0(M)$ such that it is zero when evaluated on any horizontal vector $\hat{X}$.*

Remark 2.51 The vertical volume form (2.61) is not equivariant. However, given two connections ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$ and ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$, if $dvol_V(1)$ is the vertical volume form constructed with the connection ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ and $\hat{X}(2) \in \Gamma\, {}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$, one has that $dvol_V(1)(...,\hat{X}(2),...) = 0$.

Example 2.52 The vertical vector sub-bundle ${}^k\tilde{\pi}_V : {}^k\mathcal{V} \longrightarrow M$ embedded in a fiber orientable tangent bundle $TJ^k_0(M)$ admits a vertical volume form. Let

$$\sigma : {}^k\mathcal{V} \longrightarrow TJ^k_0(M)$$

be a fiber preserving embedding and let $dvol_J$ be a volume form on each fiber. Let ${}^k\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ be a connection such that $\{{}^hX_1, ..., {}^hX_n\}$ generates locally a horizontal distribution. Then

$$\sigma^*\left(\iota_{{}^hX_1} \cdots \iota_{{}^hX_n}\, dvol_J\right) \tag{2.62}$$

is a nk-volume form on ${}^k\mathcal{V}$.

Examples of vertical volume form are also the following,

Example 2.53 1. Let $E = M \times V$, with V be a vertical vector space of dimension d and a basis for V $\{e_1,...,e_d\}$ the dual basis is $\{e^1,...,e^d\}$. A vertical form along the fiber is given by the exterior product of 1-forms

$$dvol_V = e^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e^d.$$

Then any top-form $dvol_V$ of degree equal to $dim(V)$ and non-zero everywhere determines a vertical top form on E by $(\pi_E)^*(dvol_V)$.

2. Let $\pi_E : E \longrightarrow M$ be an orientable vector bundle od dimension $n+d$ with $dvol_E$ a $n+d$-volume form on E. Let us also assume that (M, η) is a flat pseudo-Riemannian manifold. Then there is a globally defined orthonormal frame $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ on M. Then
$$\iota_{e_1} \cdots \iota_{e_n} dvol_E$$
is a globally defined vertical volume form.

3. An orientable fiber bundle $\mathcal{E}$ with an horizontal distribution $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{E}}$ admits a vertical volume form, constructed in a similar way as in (2.50).

The normalization function $w({}^k x)$ is defined by the normalization condition,

$$\int_{{}^k\tilde{\pi}_V^{-1}(x)} dvol_V = 1. \qquad (2.63)$$

Also

Proposition 2.54 *Given the vertical volume form $dvol_V$ as in (2.61), there is a local frame $\{E_1, ..., E_{nk}\}$ such that $dvol_V(E_1, ..., E_{nk}) = 1$.*

Proof. Let $\{\tilde{E}_1, ..., \tilde{E}_n\}$ be an arbitrary local frame for the vertical bundle. Since the volume form acting on a basis is different than zero and finite, the result is obtained dividing by the factor $dvol_V(E_1, ..., E_{nk})$ the first element $\tilde{E}_1$ of the local frame. □

Example 2.55 If (M, η) is flat, the existence of a vertical volume form on the bundle $J^k_0(M)$ is assured. Then a global holonomic frame along the fiber ${}^k\pi^{-1}(x)$ is $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}, \cdot, ..., \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{nk}}\}$ and the vertical volume form can be written locally as

$$dvol_V({}^k x) := w({}^k x)\delta y^1, \wedge, ..., \wedge \delta y^{nk}.$$

We will consider vertical volume forms that are closed,

$$d_J(dvol_V) = 0. \qquad (2.64)$$

Closed vertical volume forms are nk-calibration forms,

Proposition 2.56 *A closed vertical volume form $dvol_V$ on $J^k_0(M)$ is a nk-calibration in the sense of [28].*

Proof. Given $T_{nk}(x)$ any nk-dimensional vector sub-space of $T_u J^k_0(M)$. If there is a $\xi \in T_{nk}(u) \cap {}^k\mathcal{H}_u \neq \emptyset$ then $dvol_V|_{T_{nk}} = 0$. If $T_{nk} = {}^k\hat{\mathcal{V}}$, then there is a nk-vector ξ_{nk} with $dvol_V(\xi_{nk}) = 1$. The result follows by linearity of the action of $dvol_V$ on nk-vectors. □

2.13 Cohomology of differential forms $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$

The fact that the operator d_4 is nilpotent implies the existence of some interesting cohomology theories.

Definition 2.57 *A p-form $\alpha \in \Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ is closed if $d_4\alpha = 0$; it is exact if there is a $(p-1)$-form $\beta \in \Lambda^{(p-1)}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ such that $d_4\beta = \alpha$.*

The vector space of d_4-closed forms is

$$Z_p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) := \Big\{\alpha \in \Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))\,|\, d_4\alpha = 0\Big\}.$$

The vector space of $d-4$-exact forms is

$$B^p(\mathcal{F}(M,J^k_0(M))) := \{\alpha \in \Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \\ |\exists\ \beta \in \Gamma\Lambda^{p-1}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))\, s.t.\, d_4\beta = \alpha\}.$$

The p-cohomology group is

$$H^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) :=\ Z^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))/B_p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))).$$

The cohomology $H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ is therefore defined. The vertical compact cohomology of the k-jet bundle $J^k_0(M)$ is

$$H^p_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) :=\{\alpha \in \Gamma\Lambda H^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))\ |\ \alpha_x \\ \text{has compact support on each fiber } {}^k\pi^{-1}(x)\,\}.$$

Then the compact vertical cohomology $H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ is defined in the usual way.

A further restriction is necessary for applications later,

Definition 2.58 *Let (M,η) be a Lorentzian manifold. Then the covariantly bounded k-jet bundle is the fiber bundle ${}^k\pi : J^k_{0b} \longrightarrow M$*

$$J^k_0(p) := \{(x(0),\,\frac{dx}{d\sigma}|_0,\,...,\,\frac{d^kx}{d\sigma^k}|_0),\ \ \textit{such that}$$

1. *The curves $x : I \to M,\ x(0) = p$ are smooth,*
2. *Each of the covarian derivatives is bounded*: $|\eta(D^{k-1}_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D^{k-1}_{\dot{x}}\dot{x})| \leq c_k \in R^+\}$.

The meaning of this condition can be seen by two different examples:

Example 2.59
1. For $k = 1$, this second condition is equivalent to the requirement of a maximal speed.
2. For $k = 2$, the second condition is equivalent to the requirement of maximal acceleration, dropping the requirement of maximal speed.

Let us consider the following cohomology theory,

Definition 2.60 *covariantly bounded compact vertical cohomology over* J^k_{0b} *Let* (M,η) *be a Lorentzian manifold and consider the fiber bundle* J^k_{0b}. *Then the covariantly bounded compact vertical cohomology is*

$$H^p_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M))) := \{\alpha \in \Gamma\Lambda H^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M))) \\ \mid \alpha_x \textit{ has compact support on each fiber } {}^k\pi^{-1}(x)\,\}.$$

Therefore, the cohomology theory $H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ is defined. In a similar way, one can consider the cohomologies $H^*(J^k_0(M))$, $H^*_{cv}(J^k(M))$, $H^*(J^k_{0b}(M))$ and $H^*_{cv}(J^k_{0b})$.

Remark 2.61

1. Note the restriction to $J^k_{0b}(M)$ and the associated cohomology $H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$, even for non-compact vertical forms.
2. Each of the cohomologies $H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, $H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, $H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ and $H^*(J^k_{dR}(M)$ are in principle different.
3. For each of the above cohomology theories, it is true the following homotopy invariance. If two manifolds have the same homotopy type, they have the same de Rham cohomoloy[6]. If instead of the Rham complex, one consider the complex of compact vertical forms on $J^k_0(M)$ or $J^k_{0b}(M)$, one obtains that a similar homotopy invariance holds. Since each section of $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ can be seen as an element of $\Lambda^p_h(J^k_0(M))$ and a element of $\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ as an element of $\Lambda^p_h(J^k_{0b}(M))$, one has an invariance under homotopy for the corresponding cohomologies of generalized forms,

$$H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))) \simeq H^*_h(J^k_0(M))), \quad H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M))) \simeq H^*_h(J^k_{0b}(M))). \tag{2.65}$$

We want to relate the cohomology theory $H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ with the de Rham cohomology $H^*_{dR}(M,R)$. This relation arises as an application of *fiber integration* [6], which is also fundamental for the proof of *Thom's isomorphism theorem.* We will also exploit an homotopy between $J^k_{0b}(M)$ and $J^{k-1}_0(M)$ which implies the invariance of the associated cohomologies.

Proposition 2.62 *Let* (M,η) *be a Lorentzian manifold. Then* $J^k_{0b}(M)$ *and* $J^{k-1}_0(M)$ *are of the same homotopy class.*

Proof. Note that since the fibers are bounded, there is a finite time contraction: for each point $(x(\sigma),\,{}^1y(\sigma),\,{}^2y(\sigma),...,\,{}^ky(\sigma))$, one defines the contraction

$$(x(\sigma),\,{}^1y(\sigma),\,{}^2y(\sigma),...,\,{}^ky(\sigma)) \to (x(\sigma),\,{}^1y(\sigma),\,{}^2y(\sigma),...,\,{}^{k-1}y,\lambda({}^ky,\,{}^ky_{max})\,{}^ky), \tag{2.66}$$

with $\lambda\in[0,1]$ is a contraction in finite time. □ As a direct consequence of this we have the following

Proposition 2.63 *Let* (M,η) *be a Lorentzian manifold. Then*

1. *It holds the following isomorphisms:*

$$H^*(J^k_{0b}(M)) \simeq H^*(J^{k-1}_0(M)). \tag{2.67}$$

2. *It holds the following isomosphisms:*

$$H^*_{cv}(J^k_{0b}(M)) \simeq H^*_{cv}(J^{k-1}_0(M)). \tag{2.68}$$

Proof. We construct a homotopy between $J^k_{0b}M$ and $J^{k-1}_0(M)$. Since in both cases, H^*_{cv} and H^* are invariant under homotopy, we obtain the result. □

Definition 2.64 *Let $\pi_E : E \longrightarrow B$ be a vector bundle with orientable fiber over with $\pi^{-1}_B(x)$ of dimension l. Then the averaging along the fiber of a $l+k$ form is defined as [6],*

$$\langle\cdot\rangle : \Gamma\Lambda^{l+k}E \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^k B, \quad \alpha \mapsto \int_{\pi^{-1}_B(x)} \alpha. \tag{2.69}$$

Given the vector bundle $\pi_E : E \longrightarrow B$, let us consider the cohomology of the differential form $\Lambda^*(E)$ with compact vertical support $H^*_{cv}(E)$. Then one has the following isomorphism [6],

Theorem 2.65 *Let $\pi_E : E \longrightarrow M$ be a vector bundle of finite type over a n-dimensional manifold M. Then if the dimension of the fibers $\pi^{-1}_B(x)$ is l, one has the isomorphism*

$$H^*_{cv}(E) \simeq H^{*-l}_{dR}(M). \tag{2.70}$$

As an application, we found the following isomorphism,

Proposition 2.66 *Let $H^*_{cv}(J^2_{0b}(M))$ be as before and $H^*_{dR}(M)$ the real de Rham cohomology of M. Then*

$$H^*_{cv}(J^2_{0b}(M)) \simeq H^{*-nk}_{dR}(M). \tag{2.71}$$

Proof. One can apply Thom's isomorphism theorem to the vector bundle ${}^1\pi : J^1_0(M) \longrightarrow M$, obtaining by fiber averaging that

$$H^*_{cv}(J^1_0(M)) \xrightarrow{\langle\cdot\rangle} H^{*-n}_{dR}(M) .$$

On the other hand, one applies the isomorphism (2.68) for $k = 2$,

$$H^*_{cv}(J^2_{0b}(M)) \simeq H^*_{cv}(J^1_0(M)). \tag{2.72}$$

□

Proposition 2.67 *Let (M,η) be a Lorentzian manifold and $H^p_{bv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ as before. Then any element of $[\alpha]\in H^p_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_{0b}(M)))$ is bounded.*

Proof. Using the corresponding operator norm, one obtains the result. ☐

We need the following result, which is direct from the isomorphism (2.66),

Lemma 2.68 *Let us assume the hypothesis in Thom's theorem. Each element of a class $[\alpha]\in H^p_{cv}(J^k_0(M))$ admits a decomposition,*

$$^k\zeta\alpha = {}^k\zeta\varphi(\langle\alpha\rangle) + d_J A, \quad A\in\Lambda^{p-1}_{cv}(J^k_0(M)), \quad \alpha\in[\alpha]. \tag{2.73}$$

This decomposition is unique

Proof. By invariance by integration along the fiber $\langle\cdot\rangle$, one has that

$$H^{p+nk}_{cv}(J^k_0(M)) \simeq H^p_{dR}(M).$$

Note that for each cohomology class $[\alpha]\in H^{p+nk}(J^k_0(M))$, one has that $\langle\alpha\rangle = \langle\varphi(\langle\alpha\rangle)\rangle$. Therefore, by Thom's isomorphism theorem, $[\alpha]=[\varphi(\langle\alpha\rangle)]$ and one obtains the relation (2.73). ☐

Proposition 2.69 *There is the following isomorphism,*

$$\varphi^* : H^*_{dR}(M) \longrightarrow H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M))). \tag{2.74}$$

Proof. Let us consider the homomorphism $\varphi:\Gamma\Lambda^p(M)\longrightarrow\Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M)))$. One notice that φ commutes with d_4, $\varphi(d_4\alpha)=d_4(\varphi(\alpha))$. Therefore, it induces an homomorphism in the cohomologies,

$$\varphi^* : H^*_{dR}(M) \longrightarrow H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M))).$$

φ^* is injective, which follows from the injectivity of φ. The isomorphism (2.66) implies that (2.74) is an isomorphism. In particular, the surjective property for φ is proved as follows. Let $[\alpha]\in H^p_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M)))$ be a class of cohomology such that for each $\alpha\in[\alpha]$, $d_4(\alpha)=0$ holds. Let us define the homomorphism

$$\tilde{\varphi} : H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_0(M))) \longrightarrow H^{*+2n}_{cv}(J^2_0(M)), \quad [\alpha]\mapsto[\alpha]\wedge dvol_V. \tag{2.75}$$

Then $\langle\alpha\wedge dvol_V\rangle$ is in some cohomology class in $H^*_{dR}(M)$ and indeed $\tilde{\varphi}$ is an isomorphism by (2.66). It is clearly injective. Therefore, combined with the injectivity of φ^*, one shows that

$$dim(H^p_{dR}(M)) = dim(H^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))).$$

This finish the proof. ☐

As a consequence of proposition (2.69) and the homotopy invariance of the cohomology, we have that

Corollary 2.70 *Let $\pi_B : B\longrightarrow M$ be a sub-bundle of $\pi_V:\mathcal{V}\longrightarrow M$ with fibers $\pi_B^{-1}(x)$ homotopic to $\pi_V^{-1}(x)$. Then*

$$H^*_{cv}(B)\simeq H^*_{cv}(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M))).$$

Also, as a consequence of (2.72) and homotopy invariance, we have

Theorem 2.71 *There are the following isomorphism,*

$$H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^2_{0b}(M))) \simeq H^*_{dR}(M), \quad H^*(M,\mathcal{F}(J^1_{0b}(M))) \simeq H^*_{dR}(M). \tag{2.76}$$

2.14 Integration of generalized forms

Definition 2.72 *The integral of a form $\bar{\alpha} \in \Gamma\Lambda^p(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ on the p-dimensional submanifold M_p of M is*

$$\int_{M_p} \bar{\alpha} := \langle\Big(\int_{M_p} \hat{\alpha}\Big)\rangle. \tag{2.77}$$

Note that since $d_4(\bar{\alpha}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow d\langle\hat{\alpha}\rangle = 0$ this definition is consistent, and assures that the integral of the left does not depend of the boundary ∂M_p.

Lemma 2.73 *If $\zeta\bar{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}$, then*

$$\int_{M_p} d_4\bar{\alpha} = \langle\Big(\int_{M_p} d_J\hat{\alpha}\Big)\rangle. \tag{2.78}$$

Proof. We make use of *lemma* 2.42,

$$\int_{M_p} d_4\bar{\alpha} = \langle\Big(\int_{M_p} \hat{h}_k d_J\hat{\alpha}\Big)\rangle = \langle\Big(\int_{M_p} d_J\hat{\alpha}\Big)\rangle. \tag{2.79}$$

□

There is a version of Stokes's theorem for generalized forms and an invariance under diffeomorphisms of differential forms,

Proposition 2.74 *Let $\bar{\alpha} \in \Gamma\Lambda^p(M, J^k_0(M))$ on the p-dimensional submanifold M_p as before, such that $d_4(\bar{\alpha}) = 0$.*

$$\int_{M_p} d_4\bar{\alpha} = \int_{\partial M_p} \bar{\alpha}. \tag{2.80}$$

Proof. One uses standard Stokes's theorem,

$$\int_{M_p} d_4\bar{\alpha} = \langle\Big(\int_{M_p} d_J\hat{\alpha}\Big)\rangle = \langle\int_{\partial M_p} \hat{\alpha}\rangle = \int_{\partial M_p} \bar{\alpha}$$

□

Let $f : \tilde{M}_p \longrightarrow M_p$ be a differential function. One can define the pull-back of a generalized form,

$$f^*\bar{\alpha}(X_1,...,X_p) := \bar{\alpha}(f_*(X_1),...,f_*(X_p)). \tag{2.81}$$

Then one finds the following relations,

$$\begin{aligned} f^*\langle\hat{\alpha}\rangle(X_1, ..., X_p) &= \langle\hat{\alpha}\rangle(f_*(X_1), ..., f_*(X_p))\rangle \\ &= \langle\hat{\alpha}(f_*(X_1), ..., f_*(X_p))\rangle \\ &= \langle f^*\hat{\alpha}(X_1, ..., X_p)\rangle \\ &= \langle f^*\hat{\alpha}\rangle(X_1, ..., X_p). \end{aligned}$$

Then one obtains the following invariance under diffeomorphism,

Proposition 2.75 *Let $f : \tilde{M}_p \longrightarrow M_p$ be a diffeomorphism. Then*

$$\int_{\tilde{M}_p} f^*\bar{\alpha} = \int_{M_p} \bar{\alpha}. \tag{2.82}$$

Proof. Using the above computation, one has

$$\int_{\tilde{M}_p} f^*\bar{\alpha} = \langle\int_{\tilde{M}_p} f^*\hat{\alpha}\rangle = \int_{\tilde{M}_p} f^*\langle\hat{\alpha}\rangle = \int_{M_p} \langle\hat{\alpha}\rangle = \int_{M_p} \bar{\alpha}.$$

□

3 Maximal acceleration geometry

Let us consider the possibility that the acceleration of a point charged particle is bounded. This is an idea that goes back to Caianello [12] and that appears naturally in string theory [38, 7]. From the perspective of electrodynamics, there are two reasons to believe in a bound for the acceleration:

1. In extended models of the electron, for instance in Abraham and Lorentz's models, they are valid under the assumption that acceleration is less than a threshold value (see reference [45] for a discussion of those models).
2. The existence of a maximal value for the electric field in Born-Infeld electrodynamics [8] suggests that the force on a electron is also bounded in such theory.

3.1 Elements of covariant maximal acceleration

It seems natural to consider a formalism such that the covariant acceleration of a point particle $D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}$ is bounded with η, where $D_{\dot{x}}$ is the covariant derivative associated to the Levi-Civita connection of η. This is defined on the bundle $TM \setminus NC$, where $\pi : NC \longrightarrow M$ is the null-cone bundle determined by η. We adopt a normal coordinate system of η to perform all our calculations. A covariant formalism for geometries of maximal acceleration is developed in [23]. Although it was motivated by the problem of finding a covariant formalization of Caianiello's quantum geometry [12], the formalism that we use is independent of the details of the mechanism that bound the acceleration and from the particular value that the maximal acceleration

A_{max} can take. In this way, the theory developed in [23] can be used in a more general context than Caianellos's theory.

Let (M, η) be a smooth region of the Minkowski spacetime. Then there is defined a Sasaki-type metric on the bundle $TM \setminus NC$,

$$g_S = \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu + \frac{1}{A^2_{max}} \eta_{\mu\nu} \Big(\delta y^\mu \otimes \delta y^\nu \Big). \tag{3.1}$$

Let us consider that a timelike curve $x : I \to M$, parameterized such that on the horizontal lifted vectors $g_S({}^2\dot{x}, {}^2\dot{x}) = -1$ and such that $\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}) \neq -A^2_{max}$. Then the metric (3.1) induces a bilinear, non-degenerate, symmetric form g along the lift ${}^1x :\longrightarrow TM$ [23],

Theorem 3.1 *Let $x : I \to M$ be a curve such that*

1. *If the tangent vector at the point ${}^1x$ is $T = (\dot{x}, \ddot{x})$, then $g_S(T, T) = -1$ and*
2. *It holds that $\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) \neq 0$.*

Then there is a bilinear, non-degenerate, symmetric form g obtained by isometric embedding $e : x(I) \hookrightarrow TM$ from (TM, g_S) such that acting on the tangent vector $\dot{x}$ the value is

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x(\tau)) = \Big(1 + \frac{\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}(\tau) D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}(\tau))}{A^2_{max}\, \eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x})} \Big) \eta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof: The tangent vector at the point ${}^1x(\tau) \in TM$ is $(\dot{x}, \ddot{x}) in\, {}^TTM$. The metric g_S acting on the vector field $T = (\dot{x}, \ddot{x}) \in T_{(x(\tau), \dot{x}(\tau))}N$ has the value

$$\begin{aligned} g_S(T, T) &= \Big(\eta_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu + \frac{1}{A^2_{max}} \eta_{\mu\nu} \Big(\delta y^\mu \otimes \delta y^\nu \Big) \Big) \, (T, T) \\ &= \Big(\eta_{\mu\nu}\, \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu + \frac{1}{A^2_{max}} \eta_{\mu\nu} \big(\ddot{x}^\mu - N^\mu{}_\rho(x, \dot{x})\, \dot{x}^\rho \big) \, \big(\ddot{x}^\nu - N^\nu{}_\lambda(x, \dot{x})\, \dot{x}^\lambda \big) \Big) = *. \end{aligned}$$

By the second hypothesis, one obtains the following expression holds:

$$* = \Big(1 + \frac{1}{A^2_{max}\, \eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x})} \eta_{\mu\nu}\, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}^\mu \, D_{\dot{x}}\, \dot{x}^\nu \Big) \eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}),$$

that coincides with the value $(g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu)(\dot{x}, \dot{x})$. □ Acting on arbitrary tangent vectors along $x :\to M$, the metric g takes the value

$$g(A(\tau), B(\tau)) = \Big(\eta(A, B) + \frac{\eta(D_{\dot{x}}A(\tau), D_{\dot{x}}B(\tau))}{A^2_{max}\, \eta(A, B)} \Big). \tag{3.3}$$

Corollary 3.2 *With the above notation, one has the following relation:*

$$g_S({}^2X_1, {}^2X_2) = g(X_1, X_2), \tag{3.4}$$

for any $X_1, X_2 \in \Gamma TM$.

Proof. It is direct from *Theorem* 3.1, using coordinates and the duality properties between forms and fields. ☐

Definition 3.3 *A curve of maximal acceleration is a curve* $x :\to M$ *such that*

$$\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}) = A^2_{max}. \tag{3.5}$$

Let us assume that

$$\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x},\, D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x}) \,\geq 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Corollary 3.4 *If* $g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) < 0$ *and* (3.6) *holds, one has the natural bound*

$$0 \leq \eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}) <\, A^2_{max}. \tag{3.7}$$

This is the reason of the name of metric of maximal acceleration, since the acceleration turns out to be bounded by a maximal value A_{max}.

Let NC be the fibered manifold of null vectors over M,

$$NC := \bigsqcup_{x\in M} NC_x, \quad NC_x := \big\{ y \in T_xM\, s.t.\ g(y,y) = 0 \big\}.$$

The covariant derivative D is the induced connection on $TM \setminus NC$ induced by the Levi-Civita connection of the Minkowski metric η as it was defined in *section 2*. Therefore, there is a global coordinates system where the connection coefficients $\gamma^{\mu}{}_{\nu\rho}$ are zero. In such coordinate system $N^{\mu}{}_{\rho} = 0$ holds and therefore $D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x} = \ddot{x}$. In such coordinate system, $\gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} = 0$ and $N^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = 0$. Therefore, the coefficients(3.2) can be written as

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x(\tau)) := \Big(1 + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\, \ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}\, \eta(\dot{x},\dot{x})}\Big)\, \eta_{\mu\nu}\, dx^{\mu} \otimes dx^{\nu}, \tag{3.8}$$

that defines an element $g \in \Gamma T^{(0,2)}(M, \mathcal{F}J^2_0(M))$ in the following way. Given a curve ${}^2x : I \to J^2_0(M)$, the value of g along the curve $s \mapsto x(s)$ is $g({}^2x(\tau)) = g(\tau)$.

Proposition 3.5 *The isometry group* $Iso(g)$ *contains the isometry group of* η, $Iso(\eta)$.

Proof. It is clear, since the metric g is constructed from the metric η. ☐.

3.2 Perturbation scheme

Let us denote by τ the proper-time parameter along a given curve $x :\to M$ respect to g. The acceleration square function is defined to be using the metric η by

$$a^2(\tau) :=\, \eta_{\mu\rho}\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}\, \ddot{x}^{\rho}. \tag{3.9}$$

Since in our considerations the curves are far from the maximal acceleration condition, $a^2(\tau) \ll A^2_{max}$, it is possible to consider the following approximation:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big) &= \Big(g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + (\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x}) - g(\dot{x},\dot{x})) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big)\\ &= \Big(g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \delta(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big)\\ &\simeq \Big(g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

because the form $\delta := \eta - g$ is *small* on curves far from maximal acceleration condition one has that

$$\Big(g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \delta(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big) \simeq \Big(g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big). \tag{3.10}$$

Remark 3.6 We will keep this approximation $a^2 << A^2_{max}$ in the calculations performed in this work. This is because the function $\delta(\dot{x},\dot{x})$ adds a higher order term in the perturbative calculations that we will do. If the approximation is not keep, it will be clearly stated.

In a normal coordinate system for η, the function ϵ is defined by the relation

$$\epsilon(\tau) := \big(\frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\big). \tag{3.11}$$

The covariant definition of the function ϵ requires of a non-linear connection,

$$\epsilon(\tau) := \big(\frac{\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x})}{A^2_{max}}\big). \tag{3.12}$$

For timelike trajectories and from the relation (3.8), the relation between g and η

$$g(\tau) = (1 - \epsilon(\tau))\eta. \tag{3.13}$$

The function $\epsilon(\tau)$ determines a bookkeeping parameter ϵ_0 by the relation $\epsilon(\tau) = \epsilon_0\, h(\tau)$, where

$$\epsilon_0 = \max\{\,\epsilon(\tau),\ \tau \in I\}. \tag{3.14}$$

For compact curves, this definition always make sense. However, we will need to bound the value of higher order derivatives in order to keep such parameter bound for non compact curves. The basis for asymptotic expansions being $\{\epsilon^l_0,\ l = -\infty, ..., -1, 0, 1, ...\}$.

Also note that for curves of maximal acceleration the generalized metric (3.13) is degenerated,

$$g(Z,Z)|_{a=A_{max}} = (1-\epsilon)|_{a=A_{max}}\eta(Z,Z) = 0,$$

for all vector field along ${}^2x : I :\rightarrow M$. Therefore, more of our considerations will not be applicable to such curves. We will assume that all the derivatives $(\epsilon, \dot{\epsilon}, \ddot{\epsilon}...,)$

are small. In this way we stay away from the singularities of $g({}^2x)$ corresponding to curves of maximal acceleration.

The generalized metric g defines different kinematical relations than η. Remember that the parametrization of the world-line is such that $g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) = -1$. Also, let us assume that the monomials in powers of the derivatives of ϵ define a basis for asymptotic expansions. Then we have that

Proposition 3.7 *In a maximal acceleration geometry space, the kinematical constrains are*

$$g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) = -1, \tag{3.15}$$

$$g(\dot{x},\ddot{x}) = \frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{2}\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x}), \tag{3.16}$$

$$g(\dddot{x}^{\rho}\,\dot{x}) + g(\ddot{x},\ddot{x}) = \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\frac{\dot{\epsilon}\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x})}{2}\Big) + \dot{\epsilon}\eta(\ddot{x},\dot{x}) \tag{3.17}$$

and similar conditions hold for higher derivatives obtained by derivation of the previous ones.

Proof. The first condition holds by definition. The second relation is obtained by taking the derivative of (3.15):

$$2g_{\mu\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\rho} + \frac{d}{d\tau}(g_{\mu\nu})\,\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} = 0.$$

From the definition of $\dot{\epsilon}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}$ one has

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(g_{\mu\nu}) = \dot{\epsilon}\eta_{\mu\nu}.$$

Therefore,

$$2g_{\mu\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\rho} - \dot{\epsilon}\eta_{\mu\nu}\,\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} = 0,$$

from which follows (3.16). The third relation is obtained by deriving (3.16) and taking into account (3.15):

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(g_{\mu\nu})\ddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}\dddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}\ddot{x}^{\mu}\ddot{x}^{\nu} = \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x})\Big),$$

from which follows the third relation (3.17),

$$\begin{aligned} g(\dddot{x}^{\rho}\,\dot{x}) + g(\ddot{x},\ddot{x}) = g_{\mu\nu}\dddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}\ddot{x}^{\mu}\ddot{x}^{\nu} &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x})\Big) - \frac{d}{d\tau}(g_{\mu\nu})\ddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\frac{\dot{\epsilon}\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x})}{2}\Big) + \dot{\epsilon}\eta(\ddot{x},\dot{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Higher conditions are obtained from previous ones by derivation and algebraic manipulations. □

As a consequence one has the following approximate coordinate expressions,

Corollary 3.8 *For a geometry of maximal acceleration (M, g), given the normalization $g(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) = -1$, the following approximate expressions hold:*

$$\dot{x}^{\rho}\, \dot{x}_{\rho} := \; g_{\mu\rho}\, \dot{x}^{\mu} \dot{x}^{\rho} = -1, \tag{3.18}$$

$$\ddot{x}^{\rho}\, \dot{x}_{\rho} := \; g_{\mu\rho}\, \ddot{x}^{\mu} \dot{x}^{\rho} \; = \; -\frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0^2), \tag{3.19}$$

$$\dddot{x}^{\rho}\, \dot{x}_{\rho} + \ddot{x}^{\rho}\, \ddot{x}_{\rho} = \; g_{\mu\rho}\, \dddot{x}^{\mu} \dot{x}^{\rho} + \; g_{\mu\rho}\, \ddot{x}^{\mu} \ddot{x}^{\rho} \; = \; \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\frac{\dot{\epsilon}\eta(\dot{x}, \ddot{x})}{2}\Big) + \dot{\epsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0^2). \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. From proposition 3.7 and the fact that $g = (1 - \epsilon)\eta$, one got the above expressions as first order approximation on ϵ_0. ☐

3.3 Causal structure of the metric of maximal acceleration

For the investigation of the causal cones, the metric given by the expression (3.13) cannot be used directly, since the factor in the denominator $\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x})$ is not allowed to be zero. It is more natural to use the relation (3.2), where η is allowed to be zero.

The following proposition contains some properties of the geometries of maximal acceleration:

Proposition 3.9 *The null bundle of g is characterized by the following kind of curves:*

1. *Light-like geodesics, characterized by $\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) = 0$ and $\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}) = 0$.*
2. *Curves $x :\rightarrow M$ characterized by the condition*

$$\Big(\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) + \frac{\eta_{\sigma\lambda}\, \ddot{x}^{\sigma}(\tau)\ddot{x}^{\lambda}(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}\Big) = 0.$$

In the perturbative case when $\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}) << A_{max}$, for metrics of maximal acceleration, there is a natural way to obtain the metric η from g. Using the notation of *section 2*, let us consider the integration along the fiber,ll

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g \rangle(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) &= \frac{3}{2}\, \frac{1}{\int_{2\pi^{-1}(x)} dvol} \int_{2\pi^{-1})(x)} g(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) dvol \\ &= \frac{3}{2}\, \frac{1}{\int_{2\pi^{-1}(x)} dvol} \int_{2\pi^{-1})(x)} (1 - \frac{a^2}{A^2_{max}})\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) dvol \\ &= \eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}). \end{aligned}$$

The case where $\frac{a^2}{A^2_{max}} > 1$ corresponds to a change in the causal structure of g to η: any timelike vector with the metric η is spacelike with the metric g and viceversa, any timelike vector of g is a spacelike vector of η.

3.4 Kinematics with metrics of maximal acceleration

Let us assume that the spacetime metric η is flat. Then a notion of *speed* for the motion of a massive trajectory can be defined un-ambiguously as follows. First, one defines the *Euclidean distance* between two points p and q as the speed of light in vacuum divided by the time T_{pq} that the light takes to go from the point p to the point q. Along a timelike curve $x : I \to M$ the proper time from $x(\tau)$ to $x(\tau+\delta)$ is

$$\delta = \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu}}\, d\tilde{\tau}.$$

The averaged speed between point p and point q is defined to be

$$v(\tau) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\, \frac{1}{T_{x(\tau)x(\tau+\delta)}}. \tag{3.21}$$

In the case that we have a geometry of maximal acceleration (M, g), we adopt an analogous definition:

Definition 3.10 *Let (M, g) be a maximal acceleration geometry and let $x : I \to M$ be a timelike curve. Then the averaged speed between points $x(\tau)$ and $x(\tau+\delta)$ along the trajectory x is*

$$\tilde{v}(\tau) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu}}\, d\tilde{\tau}}\, \frac{1}{T_{x(\tau)x(\tau+\delta)}}. \tag{3.22}$$

Using the formula for the maximal acceleration metric (3.13), one can re-write the average speed as

$$v(\tau) := \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} \sqrt{1 - \frac{a^2}{A_{max}}}\, \sqrt{-\eta_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu}}\, d\tilde{\tau}}\, \tilde{v}(\tau).$$

In order to simplify the treatment, if a^2 is constant, the above expression is

$$v(\tau) := \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{a^2}{A_{max}}}\, \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\eta_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu}}}\, d\tilde{\tau}}\, \tilde{v}(\tau).$$

Note that light-like trajectories for η are also light-like trajectories for g. Also note that by definition, the speed of light has been considered constant and is associated with special null trajectories $\eta(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) = 0$.

Proposition 3.11 *Let (M, g) be a metric of maximal acceleration. Then*

1. *Along a timelike trajectory one has that*

$$v(\tau) \geq \tilde{v}(\tau) \tag{3.23}$$

and equality only holds if $D_{\dot{x}}\dot{x} = 0$.

Direct consequences are

Corollary 3.12 *Let (M, g) be a metric of maximal acceleration. Then for timelike trajectories such that $D_{\dot{x}} \neq 0$ timelike curves with average speed greater than* 1.

4 A higher order generalization of the electromagnetic field and currents

In this *section* we introduce a notion of generalized electromagnetic fields as sections of bundles $\Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$, for a integer $k \geq 0$ that will be fixed. In this way, we can use the results on exterior algebra and cohomology from the previous *section.* Due to the isomorphism (2.75) the fields can also be considered as sections of $\Lambda^{2+nk}(J^k_0(M))$, where the homomorphism of forms is $\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha)\alpha \wedge dvol_V$ and where $J^k_0(M)$ is the jet bundle over M.

It is well known that the electromagnetic field of a point charged particle is divergent (or ill-defined). We will assume that the singularity is of Coulomb type. Under such hypothesis, one can regularize all the fields, with the result that the fields that will appear on the equation of motion of a point charged probing particle is finite.

The fields before we are able to regularize the fields that will appear in the equation of motions, the fields will only be defined on $M \setminus \{0\}$. The submanifold $e(I) = S$ with $e : I \longrightarrow M$ corresponds to the region of the spacetime M where the *total electromagnetic field* can be divergent. It is in principle only dynamically determined and can happen that in some circumstances $S = \emptyset$. However, the typical example that we have in mind is the case of fields generated by a point charged particle in the framework of Maxwell-Lorentz theory. In this case, S coincides with the world-line of the point particle generating the field and the singularity is of Coulomb type.

4.1 Generalization of the electromagnetic fields as sections of higher order jet bundles

As we have noted before, we will consider first a notion of fields with a singularity sector S.

Definition 4.1 *The electromagnetic field* $\bar{F}$ *along the lift* ${}^k x$ *is a closed* 2*-form* $\bar{F}, \in \Gamma\Lambda^2(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$. *Therefore, in a local natural coordinate system it can be written as*

$$\bar{F}({}^k x) = \bar{F}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = \Big(\big(F_{\mu\nu}(x)\big) + \Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big) dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \Big), \qquad (4.1)$$

with $F(x) \in \Gamma\Lambda^2 M$.

Remarks.

1. The field $\bar{F} \in \Gamma\Lambda^2(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$. Therefore, other related fields appearing in the electromagnetic theory will also need to be *generalized* to be sections of higher order bundles.

2. $\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{F})$ is closed, $d_4\, \tilde{\varphi}(\bar{F}) = 0$ and therefore it defines an element of the cohomology $H^*(J^k_0(M))$,

$$[\bar{F}] \mapsto [\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{F}) = [\varphi(\bar{F}) \wedge dvol_V].$$

   These two ways of defining fields are equivalent and we will refer either to each of them as generalized electromagnetic field.

3. ${}^k x$ must not be interpreted physically as the world-line of the particle generating the field. Indeed the curve $x : I \to M$ corresponds to the world-line of a point charged particle whose motion can experimentally observed. Comparing such trajectories and the free particle trajectories, one should be able to identify the electromagnetic field, through the equation of motion.

4. The generalized electromagnetic field can be seen as map
$$\bar{F} : {}^k\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \Gamma\Lambda^2(M \setminus S). \tag{4.2}$$
Such map encodes the full information that one can extract from experiments.

5. Since the field $F(x)$ lives on M, it is clear that $d_4(\varphi(F)) = \varphi(dF)$.

Using the cohomology theory of forms on $\Lambda^p(M, J^k_0(M))$ one can establish the following result,

Theorem 4.2 *Let* $\bar{F}, \in \Gamma\Lambda^2(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$, $d_4\bar{F}({}^k x) = 0$ *define a higher order electromagnetic field. Then the decomposition is unique.*

Proof. It is a direct consequence from *lemma* 2.68 and from the isomorphism (2.74). Because the uniqueness in (2.68), the field $F(x) := F_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$ in (3.6) can be identified with $\varphi(< \bar{F} >)$ and since φ^* is an isomorphism, $F(x)$ can also be identified with $< \bar{F} >$ up to gauge in $H^{2+n(k-1)}(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$. This implies that
$$\bar{F}(x) = \langle \bar{F}(x) \rangle + < d_J A >,\ A \in \Lambda^{1+kn}(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S))).$$
Since $\langle \bar{F}(x) \rangle$ is unique, then $\langle d_J A \rangle = 0$. In detail,
$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{F} \rangle &= \langle \varphi(\langle \bar{F} \rangle) \rangle + \langle d_J A \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{F} \rangle + \langle d_J A \rangle. \end{aligned}$$
□

Let us remark the following property,

Proposition 4.3 *If* $[\bar{F} \wedge dvol_V] \in H^{2+4(k-1)}_c(J^k_0(M \setminus S)$, *then* $[F] \in H^2_{dR}(M \setminus S)$.

Proof. It is a consequence of Thom's isomorphism theorem. □

However, it is convenient to perform a short calculation. Let us consider ${}^k\zeta(\bar{F}) \wedge dvol_V$.Then
$$\begin{aligned} 0 = d_J({}^k\zeta\bar{F} \wedge dvol_V) &= d_J\big(({}^k\zeta\varphi(F) + {}^k\zeta(\Upsilon)) \wedge dvol_V\big) \\ &= \big({}^k\zeta\, d_4(\varphi(F)) \wedge dvol_V + d_J({}^k\zeta\Upsilon)\big) \\ &= {}^k\zeta d_4(\varphi(F)) \wedge dvol_V + d_J(\Upsilon_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dvol_V). \end{aligned}$$
From which one obtains the relation
$$d_4\varphi(F) = -\, d_4\Upsilon. \tag{4.3}$$

4.2 The generalized excitation tensor $\bar{G}$

Definition 4.4 *The excitation tensor along the charged point particle* ${}^{k}x$ *is the* 2-*form* $\bar{G} \in \Gamma\Lambda^2(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$,

$$\bar{G}({}^{k}x) = \bar{G}(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...) = \big(G_{\mu\nu}(x) + \Xi_{\mu\nu}(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...)\big)dx^{\mu} \wedge dx^{\nu}. \tag{4.4}$$

Let us consider the star operator associated with g. In this case, the field $G(x) = G_{\mu\nu}dx^{\mu} \wedge dx^{\nu}$ is defined such that

$$G(x) := \star\varphi(\langle\, \bar{G}(u)\rangle).$$

Therefore, the decomposition in the excitation tensor is unique. Note that a equivalent description of the excitation field is

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{G}) = \bar{G} \wedge dvol_V.$$

There are some advantages in generalizing the electromagnetic field in this way. For instance, defining the tensors Υ and Ξ as differential forms allow us to perform some specific integrations and to use the machinery of exterior calculus in a convenient way. Also, it is straightforward to generalize Maxwell's equations as we will see later.

We will use later the following constitutive relation

$$\bar{G} = \star\bar{F}. \tag{4.5}$$

The choice of this constitutive relation is because we are considering that the electromagnetic medium is the vacuum.

4.3 Higher order charge current density

The density current in electrodynamics is represented by a d_4-closed 3-form $J \in \Lambda^3(M \setminus S, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$. This can be generalized to

$$\bar{J}({}^{k}x) = \bar{J}(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...) = J(x) + \Phi(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...). \tag{4.6}$$

More specifically, for sources corresponding to point charged particles, the current density J is a distribution with support on the embedding $S : I \longrightarrow M$. Therefore, one requires that the support of $\bar{J}$ also lives on the lift ${}^{k}S : I \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$. We require that

$$d_4\bar{J} = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

This corresponds to a conservation of electric charge.

4.4 Geometric description of a point charged particle and other charge configurations

Let (M, η) be a time orientable spacetime. Let us consider the set of $\mathcal{C}^0$ and $\mathcal{C}^k$ almost everywhere smooth curves $x : I \to M$ with $I \subset R$. The space physical world-line curves is

$$\mathcal{C}(M) := \left\{ x : I \to M, \quad \eta(\frac{dx}{d\sigma}, \frac{dx}{d\sigma}) < 0, \quad \dot{x}\,\text{future oriented} \right\},$$

. One point particle is described by the submanifold $x(I) \subset M$. In the case that we have more than one point particle, they are described by the union of the unparameterized curves describing the evolution of each of such particles.

In electrodynamics it is useful to consider extended distribution of particles. In this case, the charged distributions are describe by submanifolds $D \subset M$ of dimension $d > 0$ which are smooth almost everywhere. An example of this kind of description is on the theory of distributional sources [46]. However, we will restrict our considerations to the case where the charges are point charged particles.

A point charged particle with world-line $x : I \to M$ has an associated lift ${}^k x : I_x \longrightarrow J^k_0(M)$ to $J^k_0(M)$. The set of lift to $J^k_0(M)$ corresponds to the set of physical point charged particles,

$$ {}^k\mathcal{C}(M) := \left\{ {}^k x : I \to J^k_0(M), \quad \eta(\frac{dx}{d\sigma}, \frac{dx}{d\sigma}) < 0, \quad \dot{x}\,\text{future oriented} \right\}. \tag{4.8} $$

4.5 Operator norms associated with generalized metrics

In order to formalize the *short distance* of such singular fields in a general framework, let us first consider the operator norm associated with the generalized metric $\hat{g}$ of the endomorphism $\bar{O} \in \Gamma T^{(1,1)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$,

$$ \|\bar{O}\|_{\hat{g}} := \sup\left\{ \frac{\|\bar{O}\,u\|_{\hat{g}}}{\|u\|_{\hat{g}}},\, u \neq 0 \right\}. \tag{4.9} $$

Defined in this way, $\|\bar{O}\|_{\hat{g}}$ is intrinsic in the sense that is independent of the local frame or local coordinates that we use and only depends on $\bar{O}$, the bilinear form g and the vector V.

Proposition 4.5 *For generalized metrics* $g(\,k^{x}) = \lambda({}^k x)\eta(x)$ *it holds that* $\|\bar{O}\|_{\hat{g}} = \|\bar{O}\|_{\hat{\eta}}$.

Definition 4.6 *Given two operators* $\bar{O}_1, \bar{O}_2 \in \Gamma T^{(1,1)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$. *Then*

$$ O_1 < O_2 \text{ iff } \|\bar{O}_1\|_{\hat{g}} < \|\bar{O}_2\|_{\hat{g}}. $$

Let us consider the isomorphism induced by the generalized metric g given by (2.38). In particular this expression determines the norm of the generalized 2-form $\bar{F} \in \Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M \setminus S)))$,

$$ \|\bar{F}\|_{\hat{g}} := \|\kappa(\bar{F})\|_{\hat{g}}. \tag{4.10} $$

4.6 Definition of generalized electric and magnetic fields

Given a timelike vector field $W \in \Gamma TM$ associated to an observer, the generalized electric field is defined in a similar way as in the standard case [5],

$$ \bar{E} := \iota_W \bar{F}. \tag{4.11} $$

The norm of $\|\kappa(\bar{F})|_{\hat{g}}$ coincides with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\hat{g}}$ of the *electric field*

$$\|\bar{E}(u)\|_{\hat{g}} = \|\iota_W \bar{F}(u)\|_{\hat{g}} = \|\kappa(\bar{F})(u)\|_{\hat{g}}, \quad u \in {}^k\pi^{-1}(x).$$

However, this is not a covariant relation, since the interpretation of $E = \iota_W \bar{F}$ as the electric field depends on the local coordinate system (determined by the integral curves of W).

Example 4.7 For a point charged particle, outside the world-line $S = x(\sigma)$, the *electric field* corresponding to $\bar{F}$ measured in the coordinate system adapted to the motion of the charged point particle is

$$\|\bar{E}_u\|_{\hat{g}} := \|\bar{F}\|_{\hat{g}}(u) = \frac{1}{r^2},$$

where $r = d_g(x, S)$ is the distance from x and S measured with the metric generalized metric $\hat{g}$.

In a similar way, the definition of the generalized magnetic field is

$$\bar{B} = \iota_W \star \bar{F}. \tag{4.12}$$

4.7 Short distance behavior of the electromagnetic field

The expression of the Coulomb field for a point charged particle suggests that we should consider electromagnetic field $\bar{F}$ such that admits the following development with the distance function $r = d(x, S)$,

$$\|\bar{F}\|_{\hat{g}}(x) = a_{-2}\frac{1}{r^2} + a_{-1}\frac{1}{r} + \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} a_k\, r^k, \tag{4.13}$$

where each of the functions

$$a_i : J^k_0(M) \longrightarrow M,\ i = -2, -1, 0, 1, ..., +\infty$$

are homogeneous of degree zero in r and smooth functions on $J^k_0(M)$. For generalized fields, given a point $x(\sigma_0) \in S$ that is an isolated singularity of the field $\|\bar{F}\|_{\bar{g}}$, for any small sphere $S^2_{(x(\sigma_0),r)}$ surrounding the point $x(\sigma_0)$ the integral one has the relation

$$4\pi Q = \int_{S^2_{(x(\sigma_0),r)}} \star\bar{F} \tag{4.14}$$

If one imposes that it must not depend on r for r finite and small enough, one has constraints on the *averaged values* of the coefficients,

$$\int_{S^2_{(x(\sigma_0),r)}} a_i({}^k x)\, d\Omega = 0,\ i = -1, ..., \infty. \tag{4.15}$$

If we impose the stronger condition that the integrals along any closing surface surrounding $x(\sigma_0)$ must be $4\pi Q$, one obtains the conditions

$$a_i({}^k x) = 0,\ i = -1, ..., \infty. \tag{4.16}$$

We adopt these relations as hypothesis. In this case the quantity Q corresponds to the total charge of the point charged particle whose world-line is the singularity S.

4.8 Analytic structure of the generalized electromagnetic fields

Given a charged point particle trajectory ${}^k x : I \to M$, the electromagnetic field outside from the singularity region S can be decomposed as

$$\bar{F}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = \varphi\big(\big(F^C_{\mu\nu}(x) + F^D_{\mu\nu}(x)\big)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu + F^{ext}_{\mu\nu}(x)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu\big)$$

$$+ \big(\Upsilon^{div}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) + \Upsilon^{reg}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu. \tag{4.17}$$

The piece $F^{ext}(x)$ corresponds here to any field which is not generated by the singularity on S. The piece $\Upsilon^{reg}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)$ and $\Upsilon^{div}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)$ are the regular and divergent pieces of the field $\langle \bar{F} \rangle$ on the singularity region S. $F^C_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is the divergent field on the world-line.

The behavior for the divergent field at short distances is

$$\| F^C \mu\nu(x) \|_{\hat{g}} = a_{-2}\, \frac{1}{r^2}. \tag{4.18}$$

Proposition 4.8 *The following relations hold*

1. *The singularity of $\bar{F}$ is such that*

$$a_{-2} = \lim_{r \to 0} r^2\, \bar{F} = \lim_{r \to 0} r^2\, F^C,$$

2. *The singularities of Υ are of the form*

$$\lim_{r \to 0} r^2\, \Upsilon({}^k x) = 0.$$

Then one has the relation

$$F^C_{\mu\nu}(x) = a_{-2}\, \frac{1}{r^2} \theta_{\mu\nu}(x), \; r \neq 0, \tag{4.19}$$

where the tensor $\theta_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is skew-symmetric and homogeneous of degree zero in r.

The radiation field is defined as

$$F^{rad}({}^k x) := \varphi\big(\langle \bar{F} \rangle)(x) - F^C(x) - F^{ext}({}^k x)\big). \tag{4.20}$$

Following Dirac [20], for the standard Maxwell-Lorentz theory the *radiation field* is finite on the whole spacetime M. In such theory, the radiation reaction field,

$$F^{rad}(x) = F^{ret} - F^{adv}. \tag{4.21}$$

with F^{ret} and F^{adv} are the retarded and advanced fields, obtained from the corresponding Liénard-Wiechert potentials. A balance equation analysis provides the following value for the radiation field on the world-line $x : I \to M$ [20],

$$F^{rad} = F^D_{\mu\nu} = \frac{4}{3}\Big(\frac{d^3 x_\mu}{d\tau^3}\frac{d^2 x_\nu}{d\tau^2} - \frac{d^3 x_\nu}{d\tau^3}\frac{d^2 x_\mu}{d\tau^2}\Big), \tag{4.22}$$

where τ is the proper-time along S calculated using the metric η and $\frac{dx_\mu}{d\tau} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau}$. This field is finite.

The higher order piece $\Upsilon^{div}_{\mu\nu}$ of $\bar{F}$ must be such that asymptotically

$$\big(F^C_{\mu\nu}(x) + \Upsilon^{div}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big) \longrightarrow F^C_{\mu\nu}(x), \tag{4.23}$$

when $r \to 0$. Therefore, we can assume that

$$\Upsilon^{div}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = 0. \tag{4.24}$$

This is in concordance with Dirac's result on the regularity of the radiation field.

In the following of this paper the regular part Υ^{reg} is just denoted by Υ (and similarly for the regular part for Ξ, Ξ^{reg}). Let us consider the field generated by a point charged particle, which is also considered to be the *absorber*. If $F^{ext} = 0$, out from the world-line $(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}...)$, all the fields in (4.2) are finite and one can write

$$\bar{F}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = \big(F^C_{\mu\nu}(x) + F^{rad}_{\mu\nu}({}^k x) + \Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu. \tag{4.25}$$

The pieces which are not Coulomb fields are assumed to be analytic functions of the Euclidean distance to the world-line. Therefore, at zero order approximation in the distance to the particle world line, one can write the relations for the regularized radiation field (the Coulomb field does not contribute to the radiation),

$$\bar{F}^{rad}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) := \big(F^{rad}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) + \Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu, \tag{4.26}$$

and the corresponding

$$\bar{G}^{rad}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) := \big(G^{rad}_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) + \Xi_{\mu\nu}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...)\big)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu. \tag{4.27}$$

All the fields in (4.26) and (4.27) are smooth on M.

4.9 Physical interpretation of the generalized fields

In *section 1* we motivated the introduction of the generalized fields. The main reason was based on the criticism of the concepts of external field-test particle. The solution that we provide is to substitute both notions by

1. A notion of field that depends on the state of motion of the particle that is measuring the field,
2. A higher order notion of trajectory.

The first point above it does not only mean that the field affect the motion of the probing point particle, but that the probing point particle affect the field. The second point is necessary to *reduce* the order of the differential equation of point particles.

The derivatives of the probing particles are bounded. This is a convenient technical requirement, that is translate also on the fields by the dependence on the coordinates $({}^k x(s))$. Because of the vertical boundness condition, it is well defined the vertical integration operation that allows to pass from fields $\bar{F}({}^k x)$ to fields $F(x)$ by integration along the vertical fibers.

4.10 Physical interpretation of $F = \langle\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{F})\rangle$

Since $F(x)$ lives on the spacetime manifold M, it seems natural to think F as the standard electromagnetic field, outside the world-line S. However, this interpretation is not appropriated. First of all, such interpretation is in conflict with the original motivation to introduce the field $\bar{F}$. In the framework of fields $\bar{F}({}^kx)$, it is not longer valid the notion of external field and test particle. Only in special physical configurations when the field $\bar{F} - \varphi\langle F\rangle$ is small compared with $\bar{F}$ (in the sense of the norm (4.9)) one can approximate the pair $(\bar{F},\, {}^kx(s))$ by the pair $(F, x(s))$. In such case, the language of external fields and test particles is useful to describe the physical phenomena.

An alternative and natural interpretation of the field F comes from its definition as result of an integration along the fiber. If $F = \langle\, {}^k\zeta(\bar{F})\rangle$, then it can be thought as the expected valued of a physical measurement. In addition, the statistical distribution that one considers are compact distributions along the fibers. The integration is performed using a solution of a kinetic model [21]. In this case, one has a relation between kinetic theory and special calibration forms, in the sense that the solution of the kinetic model corresponds to the special calibration.

5 The Lorentz-Dirac equation in the framework of higher order electromagnetic fields and maximal acceleration geometry

In this *section* we derive the standard Lorentz-Dirac equation using a simple argument due to Rorhlich. Then we reconsider the derivation in the framework of higher order fields. In this *section*, the spacetime is four dimensional and the metric is the Minkowski metric η with signature $(-1,1,1,1)$. For instance, all the contractions and lowering indices operations performed in this *section* are done using η. The parameter τ is the proper time along a given curve respect to the Minkowski metric η. The calculations are performed in a normal coordinate system of η, where it has the diagonal form $(-1,1,1,1)$.

5.1 A simple derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac force equation

The Lorentz-Dirac equation describes the motion of a point charged field interacting with its own electromagnetic and an *exterior field.* In a normal coordinate system of η, it is the third order differential equation

$$m\,\ddot{x}^{\mu} = eF^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\,\dot{x}^{\nu} + \frac{2}{3}e^2\left(\dddot{x}^{\mu} - (\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}_{\rho})\dot{x}^{\mu}\right), \quad \ddot{x}^{\mu}\ddot{x}_{\mu} := \ddot{x}^{\mu}\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\mu\sigma}. \tag{5.1}$$

This equation contains run-away and pre-accelerated solutions [20], both against what is observed in everyday experience and in contradiction with the first Newton's law of classical dynamics.

We present a simple derivation of this equation (5.1). This derivation is what we have called *Rohrlich's argument* [42]. This illustrates a method that we will use in subsequent sections. One starts with the Lorentz force equation for a point particle interacting with an electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu}$ [5],

$$m_b\,\ddot{x}^{\mu} \;=\; eF_{\mu\nu}\,\dot{x}^{\nu}, \tag{5.2}$$

where m_b is the *bare mass* and e the electric charge of the particle. Note that the bare mass renormalized already the Coulomb field divergence that appear on the right hand side and therefore, all the quantities that appear are finite. Both sides of (5.2) are consistently orthogonal to $\dot{x}$. If one wants to generalize the equation to have into account the radiation reaction, one can add to the right a vector field along the curve $x : R \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$,

$$\begin{tikzcd} & J^k_0(M) \arrow[d, "{}^k\pi"] \\ I \arrow[ur, "Z"] \arrow[r, "x"] & M. \end{tikzcd}$$

The orthogonality condition $\eta(Z(\tau), \dot{z}(\tau)) = 0$ implies the following general expression for Z,

$$Z^{\mu}(\tau) = P^{\mu}{}_{\nu}(\tau)\big(a_1\dot{x}^{\nu}(\tau) + a_2\,\ddot{x}^{\nu}(\tau) + a_3\,\dddot{x}^{\nu}\big), \quad P_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \dot{x}_{\mu}(\tau)\dot{x}_{\nu}(\tau), \quad \dot{x}_{\mu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\,\dot{x}^{\nu}. \tag{5.3}$$

Using orthogonality we can write $a_1 = 0$. Then using the kinematical relations

$$\dddot{x}^{\rho}\,\dot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma} \;=\; -\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma}, \quad \ddot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}_{\mu} = 0,$$

one obtains the relation

$$Z^{\mu}(\tau) = \; a_2\ddot{x}^{\mu}(\tau) + \; a_3(\dddot{x}^{\mu} \; - (\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma})\,\dot{x}^{\mu})(\tau).$$

The term $a_2\ddot{x}$ combines with the left hand side to *renormalize* the mass

$$(m_b - a_2)\ddot{x}^{\mu} \;=\; m\ddot{x}^{\mu}. \tag{5.4}$$

The argument from Rohrlich is completed after realizing that in order to obtain the Lorentz-Dirac equation, one needs $a_3 \;=\; 2/3\,e^2$. The same equation is obtained if instead of searching for a term containing the whole piece $a_3(\dddot{x}^{\mu}(\tau) - (\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma})\,\dot{x}^{\mu})(\tau)$, one requirers right hand side is compatible with the relativistic Larmor's law [30, 42],

$$\dot{P}^{\mu}_{rad}(\tau) = \frac{2}{3}\,e^2(\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma})(\tau)\,\dot{x}^{\mu}(\tau). \tag{5.5}$$

In order to recover this relation, the minimal piece required in the equation of motion of a charged particle is $-2/3e^2(\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\rho}\eta_{\rho\sigma})\dot{x}^{\mu}$. The Schott term $\frac{2}{3}\,e^2\dddot{x}$ is a total derivative. It does not contribute to the averaged power emission of radiation. However, in the above argument, the radiation reaction term and the Schott term are necessary, due to the kinematical constraints of η [20].

There are some points that makes the Rohrlich argument not completely satisfactory. One difficulty is related with the structure of the vector $Z^{\mu}(\tau)$. In principle one can add pieces with higher derivatives and there is not a justification in the argument for the absence of such pieces. There is also the possibility to introduce an additional term in the Lorentz force of the form

---

[5] Indeed one can use the same argument if instead of the Lorentz force one uses an external force orthogonal to the 4-velocity.

$$Y^{\mu}(\tau) = (B^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu} - \dot{x}^{\mu}B^{\nu})(\tau)\dot{x}^{\rho}(\tau)\eta_{\nu\rho}. \tag{5.6}$$

The vector field $B^{\mu}(\tau)$ along $x(\tau)$ can be arbitrary. Therefore, it seems that although compelling, Rohrlich's argument is incomplete and several questions arise,

1. Why one needs to start with the Lorentz force equation?
2. What is the origin of the additional terms like $Z^{\mu}(\tau)$ or $Y^{\mu}(\tau)$ to the Lorentz force in the equation of motion?
3. Why there are not higher derivative terms?

It is clear that one can consider an adapted (Frenet) frame to the curve. For curves embedded in R^n with the canonical flat connection, this method works if $\{\dot{x}(s), \ddot{x}(s), ..., x^{(4)}(s)\}$ is a frame along $x : [0,1] \longrightarrow M$; singularities must be treated individually. However, this argument still provide an insight to answer questions two and three before. However, question one is still quite elusive from such perspective.

5.2 Rohrlich's derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac equation in the framework of higher order fields

Let us consider Rohrlich argument in the framework of generalized electromagnetic fields introduced in *section 2*. In particular, the field defined by equation (4.26), when evaluated on the lift ${}^{k}x(s)$ of the world-line $x(\tau)$ of a charged particle is

$$\bar{F}^{rad}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \dddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)}) = \big(F^{rad}_{\mu\nu}(x) + \Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \dddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\big)dx^{\mu} \wedge dx^{\nu}.$$

We need to consider the following limit,

$$\lim_{{}^{k}x \longrightarrow {}^{k}S} \big(F^{rad}_{\mu\nu}(x) + \Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \dddot{x}, ..., x^{(k)})\big). \tag{5.7}$$

The fact that all the fields appearing in (5.7) are finite is because the analytic structure discussed in subsection 3.7. The result of such limit is the field that the particle described by the world-line S feel. As such, it is the responsible of the radiation and must therefore be consistent with the covariant power radiation law (5.5). In the previous subsection we give one following solution to such compatibility condition, which was put write $F^{rad}(S) = F^{D}(S)$, $\Upsilon = 0$. In this subsection we make the exercise to make $F^{rad}(S) = 0$ and we find a solution for $\lim_{{}^{k}x \to {}^{k}S} \Upsilon({}^{k}x)$ which is consistent with (5.5). The piece $\Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \dddot{x}, ...)\dot{x}^{\nu}$ must be formally like $Z^{\mu}(s)$. Let us write a formal series for Υ contracted with $\dot{x}$ (using η to down indices),

$$\Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \dddot{x}, ...)\dot{x}^{\nu} = \upsilon_1\dot{x}_{\mu} + \upsilon_2\ddot{x}_{\mu} + \upsilon_3\dddot{x}_{\mu} + ...$$

The minimal choice of the coefficients in the expansion that much such compatibility are

$$\upsilon_1 = -\frac{2}{3}(e^2)\ddot{x}^{\rho}\,\ddot{x}^{\sigma}\eta_{\rho\sigma}, \quad ,\upsilon_2 = 0, \quad \upsilon_3 = \frac{2}{3}(e^2), \quad \upsilon_k = 0, \forall k \geq 4. \tag{5.8}$$

The value of υ_1 is necessary to recover the standard radiation reaction term. The value of υ_2 is zero by simplicity, if one does not consider the divergent Coulomb field of the particle. Note that considering the divergent Coulomb fields it is possible. However, in this case everything has to be considered before taking the limit ${}^kx \longrightarrow {}^S$. Indeed, if one considers the electromagnetic mass originated by the Coulomb field, it will be compensate with a convenient υ_2 term, producing a renormalization of the mass. υ_3 has this value in order to have $Z^\mu\,\dot{x}^\rho\eta_{\mu\rho} = 0$.

Apart from the arbitrary election $\upsilon_k = 0$, $k \geq 4$, there are more extra terms that we can add. For instance, a term like (5.6) it also possible to write down in the equation of motion. If we do this, the equation of motion has the following form

$$m\,\ddot{x}^\mu = \ eF^\mu{}_\nu\,\dot{x}^\nu + \frac{2}{3}e^2\left(\dddot{x}^\mu + (\ddot{x}^\rho\,\ddot{x}_\rho)\dot{x}^\mu\right) + \ \big(B^\mu\dot{x}^\nu - \ \dot{x}^\mu B^\nu\big)\dot{x}_\nu$$

$$+\big(C^\mu\ddot{x}^\nu - \ \ddot{x}^\mu C^\nu\big)\dot{x}_\nu + \big(D^\mu\dddot{x}^\nu - \ \dddot{x}^\mu D^\nu\big)\dot{x}_\nu, \tag{5.9}$$

with $B(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...)$, $C(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...)$ and $D(x,\dot{x},\ddot{x},\dddot{x},...)$ elements of the jet bundle $J^k_0(M)$. This equation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} m\,\ddot{x}^\mu \ &= \ eF^\mu{}_\nu\,\dot{x}^\nu + \ P^\mu{}_\nu\,Z^\nu \ + \ \big(B^\mu\dot{x}_\nu - \ \dot{x}^\mu B_\nu\big)\dot{x}^\nu \ + \big(C^\mu\ddot{x}^\nu - \ \ddot{x}^\mu C^\nu\big)\dot{x}_\nu \\ &\quad + \ \big(D^\mu\dddot{x}^\nu - \ \dddot{x}^\mu D^\nu\big)\dot{x}_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

5.3 Rohrlich's derivation of the Lorentz-Dirac equation with maximal acceleration

Using the kinematical constraints for metrics of maximal acceleration, we can repeat Rohrlich's argument to obtain the Lorentz-Dirac equation. It will have a small modification due to the bound in the acceleration. Indeed, using the same notation than in *section 4* and with $\Upsilon = \sum_{i=1}^k\,\lambda_i\,x^{(k)}$, one obtains

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\ddot{x}^\rho\,\ddot{x}_\rho, \quad \lambda_2 = 0, \quad \lambda_3 = \frac{2}{3}\,e^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0), \quad \lambda_k = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 4. \tag{5.10}$$

The corresponding modified Lorentz-Dirac equation is

$$m\,\ddot{x}^\mu = \ eF^\mu{}_\nu\,\dot{x}^\nu + \frac{2}{3}e^2\left(\dddot{x}^\mu - (\ddot{x}^\rho\,\ddot{x}^\sigma\eta_{\rho\sigma})\dot{x}^\mu\right) + \ \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0), \tag{5.11}$$

with $F^\mu{}_\nu := \ \eta^{\mu\rho}F_{\rho\sigma}$. Therefore, at leading order, the equation that we obtain if the geometry is of maximal acceleration but with ordinary fields is formally the Lorentz-Dirac equation. We have not considered the electrostatic contribution to the mass coming from the Coulomb field. If one wants to consider such contribution and use a renormalization procedure one needs $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ and then use a renormalization of the mass to eliminate the divergence that appears.

6 A equation of motion of a charged particle interacting with generalized electromagnetic fields

6.1 Derivation of the equation of motion

In this *section* we obtain a relativistic dynamical model for particles with concentrated charge. The evolution of the particles will be described by second order differential equations compatible with Larmor's covariant formula (5.5). The fact that we impose the requirement of being a second order differential equation is one of the main differences with standard approaches to the electrodynamics of classical charged particles, in particular with the Landau-Lifshitz model. In such model, one finds an equivalent second order differential equation from a third order differential equation.

Let us assume that the spacetime metric is of the type of the maximal acceleration. One motivation to consider such metrics is that they provide a natural perturbation parameter. We will perform our calculations in a normal coordinate system of η. The metric η is globally constant and therefore $N^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = 0$. Also, let us assume that the physical trajectory of a point charged particle is a smooth curve of class $\mathcal{C}^k$ such that $g(\dot{x}, \dot{x}) = -1$, $\dot{x}^0 > 0$ and such that the acceleration field is bounded from above. Using the generalized tensor fields introduced in *section 2*, one obtains the following general form for the differential equation, for analytical extensions

$$\Upsilon_{\mu\nu}(x,\, \dot{x},\, \ddot{x},\, \ddot{x}, ...) = B_{\mu}\dot{x}_{\nu} - B_{\nu}\dot{x}_{\mu} + C_{\mu}\dot{x}_{\nu} - C_{\nu}\dot{x}_{\mu} + D_{\mu}\dot{x}_{\nu} - D_{\nu}\dot{x}_{\mu} + ... \quad \dot{x}_{\mu} = g_{\mu\nu}\,\dot{x}^{\nu}.$$

Now we use the hypothesis that to first order on ϵ_0, Rohrlich's argument implies the Lorentz-Dirac equation[6]. This implies that we will have the expression

$$\begin{aligned} m_b\, \ddot{x}^{\mu} = {} & e\, F^{\mu}{}_{\nu} + \big(B^{\mu}\dot{x}_{\nu} - \dot{x}^{\mu}B_{\nu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & + \big(C^{\mu}\ddot{x}_{\nu} - \ddot{x}^{\mu}C_{\nu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu} + \big(D^{\mu}\dddot{x}_{\nu} - \dddot{x}^{\mu}D_{\nu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu} + ..., \end{aligned}$$

and with $F^{\mu}_{\nu} := g^{\mu\rho}F_{\rho\sigma} = \eta^{\mu\rho}F_{\rho\sigma}$. On the right hand side of the above expression all the contractions that appear in expressions like $\big(B^{\mu}\dot{x}_{\nu} - \dot{x}^{\mu}B_{\nu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu}$, etc, are performed with the metric g instead of the Minkowski metric η. The term $\delta m\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}$ corresponds to the electrostatic mass due to the Coulomb force [30]. The other terms come from the higher order terms of the expression (4.2) of the electromagnetic field.

The general form of a k-jet along a smooth curve $x : R \to M$ implies the relations

$$\begin{aligned} B^{\mu}(s) &= \beta_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \beta_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \beta_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \beta_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \cdots, \\ C^{\mu}(s) &= \gamma_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \cdots, \\ D^{\mu}(s) &= \delta_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Note than in principle we can add higher derivative terms. However, the treatment of them will be the same than the fourth derivative term and eventually all of them will vanish. Therefore, one obtains the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} m_b\, \ddot{x}^{\mu} = {} & \big((\beta_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s)\dot{x}_{\nu} + \beta_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s)\dot{x}_{\nu} + \beta_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s)\dot{x}_{\nu} + \beta_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s)\dot{x}_{\nu})\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & - (\beta_1\, \dot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \beta_2\, \ddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \beta_3\, \dddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \beta_4\, \ddddot{x}_{\nu}(s))\dot{x}^{\mu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & + \big((\gamma_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \gamma_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s))\ddot{x}_{\nu})\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & - (\gamma_1\, \dot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \gamma_2\, \ddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \gamma_3\, \dddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \gamma_4\, \ddddot{x}_{\nu}(s))\ddot{x}^{\mu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & + \big((\delta_1\, \dot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_2\, \ddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_3\, \dddot{x}^{\mu}(s) + \delta_4\, \ddddot{x}^{\mu}(s))\dddot{x}_{\nu})\dot{x}^{\nu} \\ & - (\delta_1\, \dot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \delta_2\, \ddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \delta_3\, \dddot{x}_{\nu}(s) + \delta_4\, \ddddot{x}_{\nu}(s))\dddot{x}^{\mu}\big)\dot{x}^{\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

---

[6] Strictly speaking, this not necessary. One can do the same analysis without mention Lorentz-Dirac equation and just follow Rohrlich's argument for the above general expression.

Let us assume that there are not derivatives higher than 2 in the differential equation of a point charged particle. One way to achieve this is to impose that all the coefficients for higher derivations equal to zero, $\beta_k = \gamma_k = \delta_k = 0,\ k > 3$ and $\gamma_3 = \delta_3 = 0$. With this choice and using the kinetic relations for g, one obtains the expression

$$m_b\,\ddot{x}^\mu = -\beta_2\ddot{x}^\mu + \beta_3\,\dddot{x}^\mu - \frac{1}{2}\beta_2\,\dot{\epsilon}\,\dot{x}^\mu - \beta_3\,(-a^2(\tau) + \dddot{\epsilon})\dot{x}^\mu. \tag{6.1}$$

The differential equation governing the motion of a charge particle must be of second order and compatible with power radiation formula (5.5).Therefore, if $\dot{\epsilon}(\tau)$ is different than zero, one obtains the relations

$$\beta_2 = \frac{4}{3}e^2\,a^2(s)\,\frac{1}{\dot{\epsilon}}, \tag{6.2}$$

$$\beta_k = 0,\ \forall k \geq 3. \tag{6.3}$$

Therefore, considering the leading terms in ϵ_0 we obtain the differential equation for a charged particle in a higher order field in the case that $a^2 \neq 0$ and $(A^2_{max})^{-1} \neq 0$,

$$m_b\,\ddot{x}^\mu = \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\,a^2(s)\,\dot{x}^\mu - \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\,a^2(s)\,\frac{1}{\dot{\epsilon}}\,\ddot{x}^\mu.$$

There is a re-normalization of the *bare mass*. For $\dot{\epsilon} \neq= 0$ one obtains

$$m_b + \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\,a^2(s)\,\frac{1}{\dot{\epsilon}} = m, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \neq 0. \tag{6.4}$$

If we add an external field $F^\mu{}_\nu$ interacting with the particle, we find the differential equation

$$m\,\ddot{x}^\mu = e\,F^\mu{}_\nu\,\dot{x}^\nu - \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\,\eta_{\rho\sigma}\,\ddot{x}^\rho\ddot{x}^\sigma\,\dot{x}^\mu, \quad F^\mu{}_\nu = g^{\rho\nu}F_{\rho\nu}. \tag{6.5}$$

In the case $a^2 = 0$, we postulate the same differential equation, which is equivalent to Newton's first law.

One can express the equation of motion (6.5) in a covariant way as

$$m\,D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x} = e\widetilde{\iota_{\dot{x}}F}(x(s)) - \frac{2}{3}\,e^2\eta(D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x}, D_{\dot{x}}\,\dot{x}), \tag{6.6}$$

where $D_{\dot{x}}$ is the non-linear covariant derivative along $X = (\dot{x}, 0) \in T_{(x(s),\dot{x}(s))}TM \setminus NC$ and $\widetilde{\iota_{\dot{x}}F} = g^{-1}(\iota_{\dot{x}}F, \cdot)$. We postulate that (6.6) is the differential equation that the particle follows.

Remark 6.1

1. Note that β_3 is multiplying a factor $\dddot{x}^\mu - (a^2)\dot{x}^\mu$. The implication of this fact is that in our scheme, going to third order budles implies the Dirac's theory. However, we have seen that with the requirement of maximal acceleration, only $k = 2$ is need to obtian a second order differential equation compatible with the power radiation formula.

2. Note that the derivation of equation (6.5) is not valid when $\dot{\epsilon}$ is zero. A separate discussion is necessary of that case.

6.2 General properties of the equation (6.5)

Let us consider a normal coordinate system for η in the next three subsections. Let us multiply equation (6.5) by itself and contract using the metric g. Using the kinetic relations of proposition 3.7 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} m^2\, a^2(1-\epsilon) = {} & e^2\, F^{\mu}{}_{\rho}\, \dot{x}^{\rho} F^{\nu}{}_{\lambda} \dot{x}^{\lambda}\, (1-\epsilon)\eta_{\mu\nu} + (\frac{2}{3}\, e^2)^2\, (a^2)^2\, \dot{x}^{\mu}\dot{x}^{\nu}\, g_{\mu\nu} \\ & -\; 2e\frac{2}{3}e^2\, F^{\mu}{}_{\rho}\dot{x}^{\rho}\dot{x}^{\nu}(1-\epsilon)\eta_{\mu\nu} \\ = {} & (1-\epsilon)\, e^2\, F^{\mu}{}_{\rho}\, \dot{x}^{\rho} F^{\nu}{}_{\lambda}\dot{x}^{\lambda}\, \eta_{\mu\nu} + (1-\epsilon)(\frac{2}{3}\, e^2)^2\, (a^2)^2 \\ & -\; 2e\frac{2}{3}e^2\, F^{\mu}{}_{\rho}\dot{x}^{\rho}\dot{x}^{\nu}(1-\epsilon)\eta_{\mu\nu} \\ = {} & \; (1-\epsilon)\big(F_L^2 - (\frac{2}{3}\, e^2)^2\, (a^2)^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

with the magnitude of the Lorentz force F_L given by

$$F_L^2 = \; e^2\, F_{\nu}{}^{\mu} F_{\mu}{}^{\rho}\, \dot{x}^{\nu}\, \dot{x}^{\lambda}\eta_{\lambda\rho}.$$

Proposition 6.2 *For any curve solution of equation* (6.5) *one has the following consequences,*

1. *The Lorentz force is always spacelike or zero,*

$$F_L^2\, \geq 0.$$

2. *In the case the Lorentz force is zero, the magnitude of the acceleration is zero,*

$$F_L^2 = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow a^2 = 0.$$

Proof. One can re-write the above expression as

$$F_L^2 = (\frac{2}{3}\, e^2)^2\, (a^2)^2 + m^2 a^2, \tag{6.7}$$

from which follows the result. □

Therefore, one has the expression for u

$$u = -m^6 C^{-1}\Big(1 - |F_L|\sqrt{\frac{1}{F_L^2} + C}\Big), \quad C = \frac{(\frac{4}{3}e^2)^2}{m^4}. \tag{6.8}$$

Using this formula, one easily proves the following

Proposition 6.3 *The differential equation* (6.5) *has the following properties:*

1. *If there is not external electromagnetic field, the* 4*-acceleration is zero.*
2. *If there is an external electromagnetic field, the acceleration is bounded by the strength of the corresponding Lorentz force.*

Proof. From 1 to 3 are consequence of eq. (6.8); the last consequence is by the hypothesis of maximal acceleration and the above properties. □

Finally, one can prove the following version of Dirac's asymptotic condition,

Theorem 6.4 *For solutions of the equation* (6.5) *it holds the following asymptotic condition,*

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} F_L(\tau) = 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{\tau\to\infty} a^2 = 0. \tag{6.9}$$

Proof. From the equation (6.7) one has that the only non-negative solution for u is just $u = 0$. Then from proposition 6.2 follows the result. □

Note that a similar condition for the acceleration follows as soon as $F^2_L = 0$ in some other limit.

6.3 Absence of un-physical solutions of the equation (6.5)

Run away solutions are solutions that have the following peculiar behavior: even if the external forces have a compact domain in the spacetime, the charged particles follows accelerating without end. Theorem 6.4 implies that equation (6.5) is free of such problems,

Proposition 6.5 *Equation* (6.5) *does not have run-away solutions.*

Proof. It is clear from (6.9). An alternative way to see this is the following. Let us assume that the external field is zero for some $\tau > \tau_0$. Then the expression for the maximal acceleration is obtained again from equation (6.5),

$$-m^2\,(1 - \frac{a^2}{A^2_{max}})a^2 = (\frac{2}{3}\,e^2)^2\,(a^2)^2.$$

The only solution is $a^2(\tau) = A^2_{max} = 0$. □

In order to investigate the existence of pre-accelerated solutions of the equation (6.5), let us consider the example of a pulsed electric field [20]. This example conveys the discovery of the pre-accelerated solutions in the Lorentz-Dirac equation. For a electric pulse $\vec{E} = (\kappa\,\delta(\tau), 0, 0)$, the equation (6.5) in the non-relativistic limit reduces to

$$a\ddot{x}^0 = \kappa\,\delta(\tau), \quad a = \frac{3m}{2e^2}. \tag{6.10}$$

The solution of this equation is the *Heaviside function*,

$$a\dot{x} = \kappa,\ \tau \geq 0, \tag{6.11}$$

$$0,\ \tau < 0. \tag{6.12}$$

This is not a pre-accelerated solution. Therefore,

Proposition 6.6 *In the non-relativistic limit equation* (6.5) *does not have pre-accelerated solutions of Dirac's type.*

Since the theory is Lorentz covariant, equation (6.5) does not have pre-accelerated solutions of Dirac's type. It is open the question if (6.5) is free of any other kind of pre-accelerated solutions.

6.4 Compatibility with the covariant power radiation

Let us discuss the mechanical power emitted by a charged particle that follows a trajectory solution of the differential equation (6.5). This is obtained by the contraction of $m\ddot{x}^\mu$ with the four dimensional tangent vector,

$$m\ddot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu\, g_{\mu\nu} = F^\mu{}_\rho\, \dot{x}^\rho \dot{x}^\nu\, g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{2}{3}e^2 A^2_{max}\epsilon g(\dot{x},\dot{x}).$$

Using the kinetic relations from g, this expression reduces too

$$m\frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{2}\,\eta(\dot{x},\dot{x}) = \frac{2}{3}e^2 A^2_{max}\epsilon$$

and therefore,

$$m\dot{\epsilon} = -\frac{4}{3}e^2 A^2_{max}\epsilon\,(1-\epsilon). \tag{6.13}$$

The solution of this differential equation is

$$\epsilon(\tau) = \frac{1}{1+\,e^{A^2_{max}\frac{4\,e^2}{3m}\tau + c}}, \tag{6.14}$$

with c is a constant of integration. Therefore, the acceleration is always bounded and at $\tau \to \infty$ goes to zero.

There is a coordinate system where the acceleration is $a = (0,\vec{a})$ and the velocity vector is $\dot{x} = (v^0,\vec{v})$. The contraction $\ddot{x}^\mu\dot{x}^\nu g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\,\vec{a}\cdot\vec{v}$ and the contraction $g(\dot{x},\dot{x}) = -(1-\epsilon)$. Then one obtains the rule

$$m\,\vec{a}\cdot\vec{v} = -\frac{2}{3}\,e^2\,(\vec{a}\cdot\vec{a})\, + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0). \tag{6.15}$$

Equation (6.15) is the mechanical power obtained from the forces acting on the particle by equation (6.5). In this sense, the non-relativistic limit of (6.5) is compatible the rate of energy loss by radiation. The same is true for (6.6).

7 The effective spacetime electrodynamics of generalized fields and charged particles

In this *section* we obtain the differential equations of the generalized fields. The metric η is flat and M is four dimensional.

7.1 Theory of generalized electromagnetic fields (minimal extension)

The *minimal extension* of the Faraday and excitation tensor fields that we consider are of the form (4.2) and (4.4), with all higher order forms equal to zero for $k \geq 3$. Except for very few terms, the higher order terms do not contribute in the minimal extension theory. We assume that the constitutive relation $\bar{G} = \star\bar{F}$. Since they are 2-forms, the $\star$ operators for η and $g = \lambda\eta$ when acting on sections of $\Lambda^2(M,\mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ coincide.

Let us consider the 1-forms

$$\{\widetilde{x^{(i)}} = \widetilde{x^{(i)}}_{\mu}\, d_4 x^{\mu}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3\},$$

that will be relevant, since are useful to define the minimal extension of the fields $F, G \in \Lambda^2(M)$ compatible with the following conditions:

1. $\bar{F}$ reproduce (6.5) as a generalization of the Lorentz force equation with radiation reaction,
2. $\bar{F}$, $\bar{G}$ are sections of $\Gamma\Lambda^2(M, \mathcal{F}(J_0^2(M)))$.

Therefore, they can expressed as

$$\bar{F}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = \big(\varphi(F)(x) + \,\beta_2\, \tilde{\ddot{x}} \wedge \,\tilde{\dot{x}}\big), \tag{7.1}$$

$$\bar{G}(x, \dot{x}, \ddot{x}, \dddot{x}, ...) = \star\big(\varphi(F)(x) + \,\beta_2\, \tilde{\ddot{x}} \wedge \,\tilde{\dot{x}}\big) \tag{7.2}$$

The value of the coefficients in a normal coordinate system are

$$\beta_2 = \,\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}.$$

Since d_4 is a skew-derivation, the following relation holds:

$$d_4(\beta_i\, \widetilde{x^{(i)}}) = \beta_i\, d_4(\epsilon) \wedge \widetilde{x^{(i)}}_{\mu}\, d_4 x^{\mu}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{7.3}$$

The expression for Υ in a normal coordinate system is

$$\Upsilon({}^k x) = \,\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}} \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}}. \tag{7.4}$$

Then it is clear that $d_4\Upsilon = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_4\Upsilon({}^k x) = \; & d_4\Big(\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}} \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}}\Big) \\ & = d_4\Big(\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}\Big) \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}} \\ & + \,\Big(\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}\Big) d_4\Big(\widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is zero, since the operator d_4 acting on functions of higher order components is zero,

$$d_4 F(x^{(1)\mu}, x^{(2)\nu}, x^{(3)\rho}) = 0.$$

The second contribution is zero, because d_4 is nill-potent,

$$\begin{aligned} d_4\Big(\widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}}\Big) \; & = \; d_4\widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}} \, - \, \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \, d_4\Big(\widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(1)}}\Big)\widetilde{x^{(1)}} \\ & = \; d_4(\epsilon) \wedge \,\widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \widetilde{x^{(1)}} \,\, - \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \, d_4(\epsilon) \wedge \widetilde{x^{(1)}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the relation

$$d_4\Upsilon(\,^k x) = 0. \tag{7.5}$$

This formula is valid in any coordinate system.

The electromagnetic vacuum can be characterize by the fact that $\bar{F} = 0$. However, it is clear the following result

Proposition 7.1 *If $\bar{F} = 0$, then $\Upsilon = 0$ and $< \bar{F} >= 0$.*

Therefore, the standard vacuum $< \bar{F} >= 0$ coincides with the higher order vacuum $\bar{F} = 0$.

7.2 Maxwell's equations for higher order fields and currents

We propose the following Maxwell's equations for $\bar{F}$ and $G = \star\bar{F}$. The homogeneous equations are

$$d_4\bar{F} = 0 \tag{7.6}$$

Because equation (7.3) and (4.2), the homogeneous equation (7.6) is equivalent to the standard homogeneous Maxwell's equations,

$$dF = 0. \tag{7.7}$$

This is in accordance with the isomorphism in *theorem* 2.71,

$$H^*(M, \mathcal{F}(J^2_{0b}(M))) \simeq H^*_{dR}(M).$$

This brings out the connection between the cohomology theory developed in *section* 2 and the theory of generalized fields.

The non-homogeneous equations are

$$d_4 \star \bar{F} = \bar{J} := \varphi(J) + d_4 \star \Upsilon. \tag{7.8}$$

For the non-homogeneous equation we note that

$$d_4 \star \bar{F} = d_4 \star \varphi(F) + d_4 \star \Upsilon = \varphi(J) + d_4 \star \Upsilon.$$

It is natural to define

$$\bar{J} = \varphi(J) + d_4 \star \Upsilon. \tag{7.9}$$

Therefore, the current J is such that

$$\varphi(J) = \bar{J} - d_4 \star \big(\frac{2}{3}\, e^2\, A^2_{\max}\, \frac{x^{(2)\rho}\, x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}}{2\, x^{(3)\rho} x^{(2)\lambda}\eta_{\rho\lambda}} \widetilde{x^{(2)}} \wedge \widetilde{x^{(1)}}\big).$$

For such current, the non-homogeneous equations are equivalent to

$$d_4 \star \varphi(F) = \varphi(J).$$

Then one obtains an effective equation of the form

$$d \star F = J, \tag{7.10}$$

which are the standard non-homogeneous Maxwell equation.

Theorem 7.2 *If (7.4) holds, then the system of equations (7.6)-(7.8) is equivalent to the system of equations (7.7)-(7.10).*

If density current $J(x) \in \Lambda^3 M$ must be associated with physical systems, it must hold

$$dJ = 0. \tag{7.11}$$

Proposition 7.3 *If (7.9) holds, then* $d_4 \bar{J} = 0 \Leftrightarrow dJ = 0$.

Proof. It is a consequence of the commutation relation $d_4(\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi(d\,\alpha)$, because of the definition 2.72. Integrating on domains $\partial U \subset M$ one obtains the same fluxes and total charge for $\bar{J}$ and J. $\square$

Let us pay attention on the boundary conditions for the generalized electromagnetic field $\bar{F}$. The problem is easily handle if one relates such boundary conditions with the boundary conditions for the field F. If the boundary of the domain $D \subset$ is ∂D and the value on the boundary of the field is $F_0(x_0)$, then it is clear the following result,

Proposition 7.4 *Given an admissible boundary condition* $F_0(x_0)$ *for* $F(x_0)$*, there is a corresponding admissible boundary condition for* $\bar{F}_0$ *given by*

$$\bar{F}_0({}^k x_0) = F_0(x_0) + \Upsilon({}^k x_0).$$

It is not clear if there is other admissible boundary conditions, apart from the one defined before. However, for a prescribed $F_0(x_0)$, the boundary condition is unique. In particular, one can apply this result to initial valued problem, where the Cauchy hypersurface $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ is lifted in $J^k_0(M)$.

Combining *proposition 7.1* with *proposition 7.2* and *proposition 7.3* we obtain

Theorem 7.5 *Let (4.2) and (4.4) be higher order fields. If (7.4) holds, then the theory described by the equations (7.6), (7.8) and (4.7) is equivalent to the theory described by equations (7.7), (7.10) and (7.11).*

Proof. It is a direct consequence of the equivalence *propositions 7.1* and *7.2* and the equivalence in the possible boundary conditions of that each system of equations can admit. $\square$

Let us introduce potentials to solve the equations (7.7) and (7.10). From equation (7.6) one can write

$$\bar{F} = d_4 \varphi(A) + \Upsilon, \quad A \in \Gamma \Lambda^1 M,$$

by the standard Poincaré's lemma. Then eq. (7.8) is

$$d_4 \star (d_4 \varphi(A) + \Upsilon) = \varphi(J) + d_4 \star \Upsilon$$

and then

$$d_4 \star d_4\, \varphi(A) = \varphi(J). \tag{7.12}$$

The $\star$ operator can be either corresponding to the metrics η or g. This is equivalent to the standard equation that one can find in Maxwell theory for the electromagnetic potential. Therefore, the standard results on existence and uniqueness of solutions for A can also be applied. Statements on the existence of gauge fixing also hold. For instance, the Lorentz gauge $\star_\eta d_4 \star_\eta \varphi(A) = 0$ is also valid gauge fixing condition. Also note that the equations are independent of the choice of the star operator (it could be both from g and form η valid), since the action is on 2-forms. Therefore,

Corollary 7.6 *In the Lorentz gauge the potential follows the equation*

$$\Box A = \star_\eta J. \tag{7.13}$$

It is easy to prove that (7.6) and (7.8) are invariant under the gauge transformation

$$A \longrightarrow A + d_4\phi,$$

with $\phi \in \mathcal{F}(J_0^k(M))$. This gauge invariance corresponds with the standard gauge invariance of the equations (7.7) and (7.10).

8 Discussion

The theory presented in this work describes the motion of point charged particles in the vacuum interacting with the total electromagnetic field. The theory makes intensive use of generalized higher order fields, that are fields acting on vector fields and with values on functions over jet bundles. This consists on an *extension* of the notion field from standard fields to fields with dependence on higher derivatives of the curve describing the particle seeing the field. Such extensions provide additional degrees of freedom that allows the fields to be adapted to the changes produces by the point charged particle used in the measurement of the field.

The main result that we have found in this paper is that the dynamics of the generalized fields and charged particles, described by equations (7.7), (7.10), (7.11) and (6.6) are consistent: it is free from the pathologies that plague the standard electrodynamic theory[7].

We also found an effective theory with fields F and G on M, described by the equations (6.6), (7.7), (7.10) and (7.11). That theory is based on the relation (7.11). Such relation is a consequence of considering maximal acceleration finite but any other acceleration small compared with it (3.7).

There are effective models of the electron where the book-keeping parameter is the classical radios of the electron. It could be de case that both approximations, the existence of a universal bound in the acceleration and a finite radius of the electron are related. For instance, extended charged models requires a limit for the acceleration, in order to preserve causality [45].

8.1 Brief discussion on the assumptions of the theory

We have made use of a number hypotheses, whose justification requires some comments. The introduction of geometries of maximal acceleration is useful to define an effective theory. Since the asymptotic condition (6.9) holds, the book keeping parameter ϵ_0 is related with the function

---

[7] One still has to prove that there are not pre-accelerated solutions of any type, not only of Dirac's type.

$$\epsilon(\tau) = -\frac{a^2(\tau)}{A^2_{max}}. \tag{8.1}$$

One can see that if the maximal acceleration A^2_{max} is infinite, then the asymptotic expansions introduced in *section 5* are trivial and such a case, the procedure to find a second order differential equation presented in *section 6* fails. Therefore, it is fundamental for our considerations to have a limit for the accelerations that a charged point particle can reach by means of electromagnetic fields.

Note that we are considering effective theories, where higher order terms in ϵ_0 are disregarded. The electromagnetic theory developed in this paper is independent of the nature of the maximal acceleration, except for the fact that it must be constant for each charged particle world-line ${}^k x : I \to M$.

The hypothesis of maximal acceleration makes natural to consider fields as sections of $T^{(p,q)}(M, \mathcal{F}(J^k_0(M)))$ with $k \geq 2$, since generalized higher order field theory is linked with the existence of maximal acceleration through a generalized metric.

We have assumed that the generalized fields are horizontal. This is one of the main differences with other higher order theories proposed in the literature (without been exhaustive, see [1, 11, 39, 47, 49, 50]). However, there are several reasons for this choice:

1. If the fields are horizontal, there is a natural geometric notion of local measurement device. Once an observer has been chosen, the measurements of a generalized higher order field does not depend on the state of motion of the measurement device, but only on the *location* of the device in the spacetime M. This does not mean that the field is living on M, but that the *fluxes produced* by the fields depend on the tangent choice of the tangent vectors defining the flux surface. This interpretation is in congruence with the interpretation of the components of a electromagnetic field F as fluxes across some elementary surfaces.

2. It also allows a causal dynamic. changes in the fields in a region $U \subset M$ propagates with the speed of light (thanks to equation (7.13)). This is not true if the fields are not horizontal.

3. Since the fields are horizontal, they could be related with high dimensional theories via a generalization of Kaluza-Klein mechanism to higher order fields. This is not yet done, but it looks a natural property of the theory. This has similarity with the reduction formalism.

4. For horizontal fields it is easy to generalize the standard theory, since one does not need to introduce dynamical equations for the non-horizontal pieces, which is at the present very complicated to guess[8].

We assumed that the equation of motion for a point charged particle must be of second order. This is a natural assumption, since it allows to maintain the principle of inertia in a natural way. Note that the theory does not constrains the dynamical equation to a second order differential equations for point charged particles, when we formulate theories with fields as sections of $T^{(p,q)}M$. The reason is that in the limit $A_{max} \to \infty$ the method proposed does not work. Indeed, it is well known that in the framework of standard fields over M and for Maxwell's electrodynamics, the equation of motion of a point charged particle must be Lorentz-Dirac equation, which is a third order equation. The Landau-Lipshitz equation, although second order, cannot be obtained from fundamental principles. It is interesting to investigated if Landau-Lipshitz can be seen as an approximation of equation (6.5) in some limit[9].

---

[8] In the Finslerian setting, a full development of higher order field theories can be found in [1, 48] and references therein.

We have restricted the possible dynamical equations by principles that are conservative. Indeed, the extension of the notion of field has been minimal. Also, we look for dynamical equations which are causal, in the sense that

1. There is a global notion of time (for instance, the spacetime is orientable),
2. The equation of motion of point charged particles must be a second order differential equation for the motion of a point particle.

The equation of motion must be consistent with the rate of energy-momentum loss by radiation. As a result, we find that (6.6) (and therefore (6.5)) is free of the pathologies of the Lorentz-Dirac equation.

We have assumed that the particle is described by one dimensional submanifold $x : I \to M$. This assumption must be considered as an approximation, since it is known that a classical particle have a finite radius [37]. Therefore, one should consider other classes of submanifolds in the more realistic description of the motion of the charge distributions. In this contest, the use of distributional sources can be relevant [46].

8.2 Relation with other higher order field theories

The use of higher order fields in electrodynamics and other field theories has been previously studied. Without been exhaustive, some earlier work in the frame work of Finsler or Finsler-Lagrange geometry can be found in [1, 11, 35, 36, 39, 47, 49, 50]. The existence of many higher order theories shows the non-uniqueness in the extensions of electrodynamics and other gauge theories on higher bundles and therefore the necessity of restrictive principles. We have followed a minimal generalization and our motivation has been to find a solution to a problem which is already contained in classical electrodynamics. We have been able to prove theorem 7.5 and show that such dynamics is free of most of the pathologies of the original theory.

8.3 Further developments

Some of the ideas presented in this paper have not been fully developed. This includes a fully developed cohomology theory of generalized forms and a extended treatment of the geometry of maximal acceleration. On the physical side, there has not been an attempt to develop experimental predictions of the theory. These are three aspects which must be develop elsewhere.

---

[9] Recently, it has been found a second order differential equations for charged particles base on a multipole expansion of extended charged configurations and self-similarity scale hypothesis [27]. It would be interesting to know the relation of our theory with that approach.

More in particular, the following can be interesting points to be investigated:

1. From the physical point of view, it is interesting to explore the following points.
    (a) Experimental predictions of the theory presented in this paper. Currently, this is a challenging point, because the radiation reaction is a very small effect. In particular, equation (6.5) can be solved for the Penning trap and compare it with the non-relativistic QED prediction [9, 44]. However, the Penning-trap system is a standard physical system where the equation of motion (6.5) can be predictive.
    (b) We have shown that geometry of maximal acceleration allows for superluminical motion. This is not surprising since there are possible scenarios in Finsler spacetime models (see for instance [33, 40]). It is known that very strong constraints for superluminical motion in neutrinos systems [?] arises by Cherenkov's radiation [15]. However, it is also known that those constrains depend on the back-ground geometry (see for instance [14]). Therefore, the natural question arises of what are the effects of Cherenkov's radiation in geometries of maximal acceleration.
    (c) We have assumed that the electromagnetic medium was the standard vacuum. However, it seems natural to extend the theory to more general media compatible with generalized fields and study the extension of current models of electromagnetic media.
    (d) We did not include gravitational effects. We think that a proper discussion of them should not require additional methods, although an additional complexity in the calculations is expected. For instance, the use of Fermi coordinates for η instead of normal coordinates is appropriated. Nevertheless, one difficulty will be to prove the existence of a vertical volume in the case when η is non-flat.
    (e) In order to perform standard theoretical analysis, one needs an action formulation of the theory. There exist actions formulations in the Finsler category [49], [39], which are integrals on the whole TM of a lagrangian $L : TM \longrightarrow R$. In a similar way, for generalized fields one expects to have action formulation of the type,

$$S[\Phi({}^k x)] = \int_{J^k_0(M)} dvol_4(x) \wedge dvol_v(y)\, \mathcal{L}(\Phi({}^k x)). \tag{8.2}$$

    There are two conditions that this functional must hold,
        i. The first condition is that the equations obtained for the extremals must coincide with (7.8) and (7.6).
        ii. It must be clarify the relation with the corresponding action of Maxwell theory,

$$S[\Phi(x)] = \int_M \Big(-\frac{1}{2} F \wedge \star F + J \wedge A \Big). \tag{8.3}$$

    (f) The extension of the theory to Yang-Mills field is natural. Indeed, from a unification perspective, this must be the case. In the Finslerian case, this has been investigated in [48]. It could be interesting to see whether the generalized fields are a mathematical description *in between* the usual local representation of gauge variables by the potential A and the holonomy variables representation, which is the natural variable in any quantum gauge theory [13].
    (g) Beyond the classical theory one has to consider the corresponding quantum theory. with a lagrangian formulation of the theory developed here, standard quantization rules can be applied.

2. From a mathematical point of view, it is interesting to explore the following basic directions:

    (a) We did not discuss a natural formalism to describe our higher order fields as it is the theory of sheaves and sheaf cohomology [6]. We think that such formulation and the use of the sheaf cohomology language can be useful to understand the structure of the theory.
    (b) A curvature theory for the non-linear connections on the spaces of jet bundles is missing.
    (c) A curvature theory for geometries of maximal acceleration is missing.

Acknowledgements. We acknowledge to M. F. Dahl, Shin-itiro Goto, J. Gratus, V. Perlick and J. P. Robinson for many valuable comments.

References

[1] G. S. Asanov, *Finsler Geometry, Relativity and Gauge Theories*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht. (1985).

[2] D. Bao, S. S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer-Verlag (2000).

[3] J. K. Beem, *Indefinite Finsler Spaces and Timelike Spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **22**, 1035 (1970).

[4] J. K. Beem, P. E. Ehrlich, K. L. Easly, *Global Lorentzian Geometry*, Second Edition, CRC Press (1996).

[5] I. M. Benn, R. W. Tucker, *An introduction to Spinors and Geometry with applications in Physics*, Bristol ; Philadelphia : A. Hilger (1987).

[6] R. Bott and W. Tu, *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology*, Springer-Verlag (1983).

[7] M. J. Bowick and S. B. Giddins, *High-Temperature Strings*, Nucl. Phys. B **325**(1989), 631.

[8] M. Born, L. Infeld, *Foundations of a new field theory*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 144, 425 (1934).

[9] L.S. Brown and G. Gabrielse, Rev. Mod. Phys. 58, 233 (1986).

[10] I. Bucataru, O. Constantinescu and M. F. Dahl, *A geometric setting for systems of ordinary differential equations*, International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics, Vol. 8, Issue 6, pp. 1291-1327, (2011).

[11] I. Bucataru and R. Miron, *Finsler-Lagrange geometry*, Editura Academiei Romane 2007.

[12] E. R. Caianiello,*Quantum and Other Physics as Systems Theory*, La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento, Vol. **15**, Nr 4 (1992).

[13] Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, *Some Elementary Gauge Theory Concepts*, World Scientific (1993).

[14] , *Neutrino superluminality without Cherenkov-like processes in Finslerian special relativity*, Physics Letters B 710, 430-434 (2012).

[15] , *New Constraints on Neutrino Velocities*, A. G. Cohen and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 181803 (2011).

[16] M. Crampin, *On horizontal distributions on the tangent bundle of a differentiable manifold*, J. London. Math. Soc. (2), 3, 178 (1971).

[17] M. Crampin, *Connections of Berwals type*, Publ. Math. (Debrecen) 57 (2000) 455-473.

[18] Shaoqiang Deng, Zixin Hou *The group of isometries of a Finsler space*, Paci. Jour. Math. (207), No. 1 (2002).

[19] M. de León, P. R. Rodrigues, *Generalized Classical Mechanics and Field Theory*, North-Holland Mathematical Studies, 112 (1986).

[20] P. A. M. Dirac, *Classical Theory of Radiating Electrons*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, vol: A137, 148-169 (1938).

[21] J. Ehlers, *General Relativity and Kinetic Theory*, Proceedings of the International Summer School of Physics Enrico Fermi, pg 1-70 (1971).

[22] R. F. Feynman, J. A. Wheeler, *Interaction with absorvers as the mechanism of radiation*, Rev. Mod. Phys, **17**, 157.

[23] R. Gallego Torrome, *On a covariant version of Caianiello's Model*, Gen.Rel.Grav. **39**:1833-1845,2007.

[24] R. Gallego Torrome, *Fluid Models from Kinetic Theory using Geometric Averaging*, Jour. Geom. Phys., 61 (2011) 829-846; *Averaged Lorentz Dynamics and an application in Plasma Dynamics*, arXiv:0912.0183.

[25] F. Girelli, S. Liberati, L. Sindoni, *Planck-scale modified dispersion relations and Finsler geometry*, Phys.Rev.D75:064015 (2007).

[26] M. Goeckeler, T. Schuecker, *Differential geometry, gauge theories and gravity*, Cambridge University Press (1995).

[27] S. E. Gralla, A. I. Harte, R. M. Wald, *A Rigorous Derivation of Electromagnetic Self-force*, Phys. Rev. D 80: 024031 (2009).

[28] R. Harvey, H. B. Lawson, *Calibrated geometries*, Acta Mathematica 148, 47157 (1982).

[29] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of the spacetime*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (1973).

[30] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, Third ed. Wiley (1998).

[31] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry, Vol I*, Wiley Intersciencie, New York (1969).

[32] I. Kolar, P. W. Michor, J. Slovak, *Natural operators in differential geometry*, Springer-Verlag (1993).

[33] A. Kosteleky, *Riemann-Finsler geometry and Lorentz-violating kinematics*, Phys.Lett.B701:137-143 (2011).

[34] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, Pergamon, Oxford (1962).

[35] R. Miron, *The geometry of Ingarden spaces*, Rep. on Math. Phys. 54(2), 131-147 (2004).

[36] R. Miron, *Finsler-Lagrange Spaces with* (α, β)*-Metrics and Ingarden Spaces*, Reports on Mathematical Physics, Vol. **58**, 417 (2006).

[37] E. J. Moniz and D.H. Sharp, *Radiation reaction in nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics*, Phys. Rev. **(15)**, 2850 (1977).

[38] R. Parentani and R. Potting, *Accelerating Observer and the Hagedorn Temperature*, Phys. Rev. Lett.**63**, 945 (1989).

[39] C. Pfeifer and M. N. R. Wohlfarth, *Causal structure and electrodynamics on Finsler spacetimes*, arXiv: 1104.1079.

[40] C. Pfeifer, M. N. R. Wohlarth, *Beyond the speed of light on Finsler spacetimes*, arXiv:1109.6005v3 [gr-qc].

[41] E. Poisson, *An introduction to the Lorentz-Dirac equation*, arXiv:gr-qc/9912045.

[42] F. Rohrlich, *The dynamics of a charge sphere of the electron*, Am. J. Phys. Vol. **65**, 1051-1056 (1997).

[43] D. J. Saunders, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 142 (1989).

[44] H. Spohn, *The critical manifold of the Lorentz-Dirac equation*, Europhys. Lett. **50**, 287 (2000).

[45] H. Spohn, *Dynamics of Charged Particles and its Radiation Field*, arxiv:math-ph/ 9908024.

[46] R. W. Tucker, *Differential form valued forms and distributional electromagentic sources*, Jour. Math. Phys. **50**, 033506 (2009).

[47] S. I. Vacaru, *Nonholonomic distributions and gauge models of Einstein gravity*, Int. Journ. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 7:215-246 (2010).

[48] S. Vacaru, P. Stavrinos, E. Gaburon and D. Gonta, *Clifford and Riemannian-Finsler Structures in Geometric Mechanics and Gravity*, Geometry Balkan Press, 2005, **gr-qc/0508023**.

[49] N. Voicu, *On electromagnetism and generalized energy-momentum tensor of the electromagnetic fields in spaces with Finsler geometry*, arXiv:1012.2100 [math-ph].

[50] N. Voicu, S. Siparov, *A new approach to electromagnetism in anisotropic spaces*, BSG Proc. 17, pp. 250-260 (2010).